

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—NO. V.

MAY, 1836.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. DR. ROGET'S BRIDGEWATER TREATISE	137	V. ANGEL OF JEHOVAH	207
Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology. By PETER MARK ROGET, M. D., Secretary to the Royal Society, &c.		Meaning of the Title, "Angel of Jehovah," as used in Scripture; being in continuation of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament."	
II. EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE	153	VI. DR. BANCROFT'S HALF-CENTURY DISCOURSE	240
De l'Influence des Mœurs sur les Lois, et de l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs. Par M. MATTER.		A Sermon delivered in Worcester, January 31, 1836, by AARON BANCROFT, D. D., at the Termination of Fifty Years of his Ministry.	
III. TRUE PLAN OF A LIVING TEMPLE	169	VII. MISCELLANIES BY HARRIET MARTINEAU	251
1. The Morning and Evening Sacrifice; or Prayers for Private Persons and Families.		Miscellanies. By HARRIET MARTINEAU.	
2. The Last Supper, or Christ's Death kept in Remembrance.		VIII. DR. CODMAN'S VISIT TO ENGLAND	265
3. Farewell to Time, or Last Views of Life, and Prospects of Immortality, including Devotional Exercises, a great Variety of which are in the Language of Scripture, — to be used by the Sick, or by those who minister to them.		A Narrative of a Visit to England. By JOHN CODMAN, D. D., One of the Deputation from the General Association of Massachusetts to the Congregational Union of England and Wales.	
4. The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life.		NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE	269
IV. THE BACKSLIDER	198	Glasgow Edition of the Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D. — Dr. Carpenter's Harmony of the Gospels. — Religious Consolation. — New Publications.	
Scenes and Characters illustrating Christian Truth. No. V. The Backslider. By ***.			

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CHARLES BOWEN.

LONDON:
ROWLAND HUNTER, AND R. J. KENNETT, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

1836.

NOTICE.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers, of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May.

All communications may be directed "To the Editors of the Christian Examiner, care of Charles Bowen."

CHARLES BOWEN,

NO. 141 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON,

HAS JUST PUBLISHED

DISCOURSES ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D. D. 12mo.

(*This volume is composed entirely of discourses never before published.*)

"The fervid and eloquent pen of the Rev. Mr. Channing, whether employed, as in the volume before us, in elucidating the truth and the beauty of the Christian Revelation and the obligations and duties of man under it,—or in critically analysing the character, the deeds, and the influence of the mighty Napoleon,—or in examining in prose scarcely less inspired than the glowing strains of the Poet himself, the works and genius of Milton,—can never appeal in vain to educated readers. In truth, we consider Mr. Channing as one of the greatest living masters of the English language; and when to the beauty of style is added the logical force of a well disciplined and highly cultivated mind,—of which, as in the work now under notice, the whole energies are devoted to prove to the understanding, and to make perceptible to the heart the reasonableness, as well as the indispensableness to happiness both here and hereafter, of faith in the Christian dispensation,—it will be readily believed that he has made a book that will be widely read. We speak not here in reference to the peculiar views of the writer as to the nature of the Saviour,—these, doubtless, though only appearing incidentally, may have the effect of diverting many from his pages;—yet we know not where, in the same space, can be found a more striking and irresistible statement of the evidences of Christianity, than in the first discourse of this volume."—*New York American.*

CHANNING'S WORKS,

Being Discourses, Reviews, and Miscellanies. 8vo. pp. 600.

This Edition contains the same matter as the first. It is intended, however, for a more general circulation; the price is therefore reduced to \$1.50, which makes it one of the cheapest works now before the public.

THE NEW YORK COLLECTION OF PSALMS AND HYMNS for Social and Private Worship. Third Edition.

Societies and others wishing for this Collection, can be furnished, by the quantity, on reasonable terms.

A NEW TRANSLATION of the BOOK OF PSALMS, with an Introduction. By GEORGE R. NOYES, Author of a 'Translation of the Book of Job.'

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Nº LXXIV.

THIRD SERIES — Nº V.

MAY, 1836.

ART. I. — *Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology.* By PETER MARK ROGET, M. D., Secretary to the Royal Society, &c. In Two Volumes. London: William Pickering. 1834. 8vo. pp. 593 and 661. — American Edition of the same Work, Two Volumes, 8vo. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, & Blanchard. 1836. pp. 408 and 463.

THIS work is the fifth in order of the celebrated Bridgewater Treatises, and is, we think, one of the best of the series. We prefer it to Kirby's treatise in the same series, on the History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals, which is now also before the public, and which we may notice in a future number. Both works are full of entertainment and interest; but Kirby is not unfrequently visionary in his theories, unsound in his inferences, and careless in his facts; faults from which, so far as we can judge, Dr. Roget is remarkably free. They have been equally diligent, however, in the collection of illustrations from the various kingdoms of nature, to bear on the great point which both had in view, the existence and providence of a Supreme Creator, who is nature's Author and God.

Believing with Dr. Roget, that "to Man have been revealed the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God, through the medium of the Book of Nature, in the varied pages of which they are inscribed in indelible characters;" and believing that the study of that book of nature, is adapted to lead the student to the knowledge, love, and admiration of the

Former and Ruler of all things, we sincerely rejoice in the appearance of treatises, which must promote, in some degree at least, a taste for natural history in its several branches, and prevent by their own serious spirit, a perversion of that taste from the great end. We rejoice to see those who are universally respected as men of science and ability, maintain by their example and authority the noble truth, that as God manifests himself in nature, so the observation of nature will conduct the candid and teachable mind to the acknowledgment of God. It is with us a favorite and delightful opinion, that the influences of the visible universe are elevating and religious, and support a trust in the unseen Creator, and a faith in his invisible world; that holy scripture is engraven on the rocks, and written on the leaves of the trees; that the praise of God is sung by the voice of every creature, and that the frame and powers and life of every creature indicate divine skill, and evince divine care, and direct the contemplative mind to a constantly increasing communion with the Infinite Intelligence, in whom they and we live and move and have our being. We therefore welcome the instructions of every one who holds in sincerity, and preaches with ability, the same opinion, and gains to it more and more converts and disciples. We earnestly desire, that men should be invited and aided, by wise and competent teachers, to become acquainted with nature, convinced as we are, that the knowledge of nature is one great step toward the knowledge of God.

It is nevertheless to be allowed, that some of those who have been eminently versed in the knowledge of God's works, have refused to regard them as God's works, and have been very far from the knowledge and love of God. This has been the case with several of the French naturalists, who have either vitiated the merit of their observations and discoveries by preposterous atheistic theories, or deprived their labors of the moral efficiency which they might have exerted, by maintaining an unbroken and too significant silence concerning the Infinite Cause. But it is altogether unfair to attribute this avowed or understood infidelity, to the influence of the study of nature, or to its want of influence. The source of it is to be looked for in an entirely different direction, — among the fields of the revolutionary French philosophy, whence arose that deadly stream of irreligion, which has stolen down through every region of French literature. All that can be said is,

that the naturalists partake of a national taint of unbelief, well known and greatly to be deplored, deeply infused and difficult of cure. We do not expect them to be religious merely because they are naturalists. Their minds have been brought into a state which resists the holy influences of nature. God compels no one to know and love him. If a man pertinaciously denies the works of nature to be the works of God, no force is put in requisition from on high, to oblige him to alter his sentiments and lift up his heart. If, while he explores the boundless treasures of created things, he determines not to ascribe the work to its Maker, the gift to the Giver, the most admirable contrivances to a Designer, he may be very learned, and will doubtless derive much pleasure and profit from his knowledge,—for so it is ordered by a kind and impartial Providence,—but he will fall far short of the highest end of all attainment; and, choosing to remain deficient, choosing to keep shut his internal eye and ear, no miracle will be worked, no supernatural power will be exerted, to overcome his perversity.

We ought not to omit stating, while speaking of French naturalists, that the acknowledged prince of them all, the sagacious Cuvier, was a believer and a religious man. It is pleasant to be able to say to those with whom great names have great weight, that he who looked more discerningly through nature than any of his countrymen, looked up reverently to nature's God. But, apart from all authority of names, it is evident that the failure of some individuals in the spiritual improvement of knowledge, is no good reason why others may not succeed, by a proper use of their means. No fact can be better established, than that he who takes with him to the observation of nature a candid mind and a feeling heart, will perceive indications of order, adaptation, and design, which are calculated to direct him to the Supreme and Intelligent Cause; and that the more diligently he observes, the more profoundly will he adore.

Nature leads us to God through the paths of design, which are traced with wonderful distinctness and as wonderful variety in all her kingdoms. The principal argument which the study of things visible builds up for the existence and glorious attributes of a Creator, is the argument of design. And it cannot be shaken. It is old, and attempts have been made to prove it unsound; but the mind of man itself is pledged for its solidity.

A fondness for new and ingenious statements, and a distaste for what is often repeated, have thrown a suspicion on the common argument of design which it does not deserve. The argument may be briefly stated thus. A contrivance, adapted to a certain end, supposes a contriving intelligence. Animated nature is a series of such contrivances, and therefore proves the existence of a Mind antecedent to them all, understanding and intending them all, the infinite Author of them all, which infinite Mind is God. This is the simple old argument, which we still assert to be, not unassailable, but unanswerable and indestructible. To object to this argument, that it omits to give a reason why an evident contrivance is to be ascribed to a contriving Mind, or, in other words, why a set of means which are brought together for a particular end, is to be termed a contrivance, seems to us to be trifling with the argument, and nothing more. If the omission is to be formally supplied, it can only be done by saying, that we ascribe the construction of an animated being to a Maker, because we ascribe our own inferior constructions to the operation of human intelligence, and because, from the very nature of our minds, we must ascribe an organized work to some intelligent artificer. This, to be sure, is coming to the ultimate fact in the case. But why the omission of this ultimate fact, which was evidently understood if not stated in the old argument, should be objected to it as a fatal defect, we cannot imagine. As it has been thus objected, however, and with some parade of words, it is well that it should be distinctly supplied hereafter; in all careful statements of the argument. This has been done in the present work of Dr. Roget. The following extract from his introductory chapter on Final Causes, furnishes a fair specimen of the argumentative portion of his book.

“ But though it be granted that all the phenomena we behold are the effects of certain causes, it might still be alleged, as a bar to all further reasoning, that these causes are not only utterly unknown to us, but that their discovery is wholly beyond the reach of our faculties. The argument is specious only because it is true in one particular sense, and that a very limited one. Those who urge it, do not seem to be aware that its general application, in that very same sense, would shake the foundation of every kind of knowledge, even that which we regard as built upon the most solid basis. Of causation, it is agreed that we know nothing; all that we do know is, that one event succeeds another

with undeviating constancy. Now by probing this subject to the bottom, we shall find that, in rigid strictness, we have no certain knowledge of the existence of any thing, save that of the sensations and ideas which are actually passing in our minds, and of which we are necessarily conscious. Our belief in the existence of external objects, in their undergoing certain changes, and in their possessing certain physical properties, rests on a different foundation, namely, the evidence of our senses; for it is the result of inferences which the mind is, by the constitution of its frame, necessarily led to form. We may trace to a similar origin the persuasion irresistibly forced upon us, that there exist not only other material objects beside our own bodies, but also other intellectual beings beside ourselves. We can neither see nor feel those extraneous intellects, any more than we can see or feel the cause of gravitation, or the subtle sources of electricity or magnetism. We nevertheless believe in the reality both of the one and of the other; but it is only because we infer their existence from particular trains of impressions made upon our senses, of which impressions alone our knowledge can, in metaphysical strictness, be termed certain.

“Upon what evidence do I conclude that I am not a solitary being in the Universe; that all is not centred in myself; but that there exist other intellects similar to my own? Undoubtedly no other than the observation that certain effects are produced, which the experience I have had of the operations of my own mind leads me, by an irresistible analogy, to ascribe to a similar agency, emanating from other beings; beings, however, of whose actual intellectual presence I cannot be conscious, whose nature I cannot fathom, whose essence I cannot understand. I can judge of the operations of other minds only in as far as those operations accord with what has passed in my own. I cannot divine processes of thought to which mine have borne no resemblance; I cannot appreciate motives of which I have never felt the influence, nor comprehend the force of passions never yet awakened in my breast: neither can I picture to myself feelings to which no sympathetic chord within me has ever vibrated.

“Our own intelligence, our own views, and our own affections, then, furnish the only elements by which it is possible for us to estimate the analogous powers and attributes of other minds. The difficulty of applying this scale of measurement will, of course, increase in proportion to the difference between the objects compared; and although we may conceive that there are powers and intelligences infinitely surpassing our own, the conceptions we can form of such superior essences must necessarily be indefinite and obscure, and must partake of the same kind of imperfection as our notions of the distances of the heavenly

bodies, however familiar we may be with the units of the scale by which those distances are capable of being expressed. When, on the other hand, the objects contemplated are more within the range of our mental vision; when, for instance, they are phenomena that we can assimilate to our own voluntary acts, and in which we can clearly trace the connexion between means and end, then does our recognition of the agency of intellect become most distinct, and our conviction of its real and independent existence become most intimate and assured.

"Such is the kind of evidence on which rests our belief of the existence of our fellow-men. Such, also, is the foundation of our assurance that there exists a Mighty Intellect, who has planned and executed the stupendous works of creation, with a skill surpassing our utmost conceptions; by powers to which we can assign no limit, and the object of whose will is universal good.*"

— Vol. i. pp. 24 – 27.

The illustrations which are then given of the analogical process on which the proof of design is founded, are peculiarly happy. The first of these, though not more ingenious than Dr. Paley's illustration of the watch, and perhaps suggested by it, is more picturesque.

"The evidence of design and contrivance in the works of nature carries with it the greatest force whenever we can trace a coincidence between them and the products of human art. If in any unknown region of the earth we chanced to discover a piece of machinery, of which the purpose was manifest, we should not fail to ascribe it to the workmanship of some mechanist, possessed of intelligence, actuated by a motive, and guided by intention. Farther, if we had a previous experience of the operation of similar kinds of mechanism, we could not doubt that the effect we saw produced was the one intended by the artificer. Thus, if in an unexplored country, we saw, moving upon the waters of a lake, the trunk of a tree, carved into the shape of a boat, we should immediately conclude that this form had been given to it for the purpose of enabling it to float. If we found it also provided with paddles at its sides, we should infer, from our previous knowledge of the effects of such instruments, that they were intended to give motion to this boat, and we should not hesitate to conclude that the whole was the work of human hands, and the product of human intelligence and design. If, in addition, we found this boat furnished with a rudder and with sails, we should at once understand the object of these contrivances, and our ideas

"* The view here taken is, of course, limited to *Natural Theology*; that being the express and exclusive object of these Treatises."

of the skill of the artificer would rise in proportion to the excellence of the apparatus, and the ingenuity displayed in its adaptation to circumstances.

"Let us suppose that in another part of this lake we found an insect,* shaped like the boat, and moving through the water by successive impulses given to that medium by the action of levers, extending from its sides, and shaped like paddles, having the same kind of movement, and producing the same effects. Could we resist the persuasion that the Artificer of this insect, when forming it of this shape, and providing it with these paddles, had the same mechanical objects in view? Shall we not be confirmed in this idea on finding that these paddles are constructed with joints, which admit of no other motion than that of striking against the water, and of thus urging forward the animal in its passage through that dense and resisting medium? Many aquatic animals are furnished with tails which evidently act as rudders, directing the course of their progressive motion through the fluid. Who can doubt but that the same intention and the same mechanical principles which guide the practice of the ship-builder, are here applied in a manner still more refined, and with a master's hand? If Nature has furnished the nautilus with an expansible membrane, which the animal is able to spread before the breeze, when propitious, and by means of which it is wafted along the surface of the sea, but which it quickly retracts in unfavorable circumstances, is not her design similar to that of the human artificer, when he equips his bark with sails, and provides the requisite machinery for their being hoisted or furled with ease and expedition?" — Vol. I. pp. 28–30.

What pleasant scenes of far away solitudes, and silent and sunny lakes, and light canoes, and cool summer sailing, are here brought before the mind. What a pure spring of kindly piety must have been gushing in the heart of the writer, when he penned those beautiful paragraphs. We will sail with him, and with such as he is, on the great voyage of discovery and knowledge, and let others, if they will, commit themselves to the guidance of those blind pilots who tempt the dark vortices of chance and atheism.

The argument of design is eminently of a cumulative character; each instance of mechanism in the works of nature being an addition to the pile of facts by which it is supported. In accordance with this view, Dr. Roget goes through the

* Such as the *Notonecta glauca*, Lin., or water boatman, and the *Dytiscus marginalis*, or water beetle.

several classes of organized existence, ascending from the lowest to the highest, from vegetables up to men, and adducing instances, throughout the whole, of the wonderful workmanship of God ; of the most curious and inimitable systems of structure, adapted to certain functions, executed after a definite plan, and denoting a wise and mighty and merciful Creator. He commences with the mechanical functions of animal and vegetable economy, which depend upon the simpler properties of matter, and the well-known laws of mechanism. He then proceeds to the consideration of the nutritive or vital functions of the same, which are of a more refined and intricate nature than the mechanical functions, as they involve the chemical properties of organized substances. He rises from these subjects to a description of the faculties of perception and volition, which belong to living animals as sentient and active beings ; and lastly he gives an account of the reproductive functions and the phenomena of animal developement.

In pursuing this course, Dr. Roget exhibits those qualities as a writer, which are requisite to the proper treatment of physiological subjects. He is evidently well possessed of the knowledge he would impart. His descriptions, of which the main body of his work necessarily consists, are clear and accurate. His definitions are precise, and the illustrations, by which he fixes them in the reader's mind, are admirably selected, and such as can hardly fail of retaining a place in the memory. Take for instance the manner in which he illustrates his definition of organization.

“ Life, which consists of a continued series of actions directed to particular purposes, cannot be carried on but by the instrumentality of those peculiar and elaborate structures and combinations of material particles which constitute *organization*. All these arrangements, both as respects the mechanical configuration and the chemical constitution of the elements of which the organized body is composed, even when apparently most simple, are, in reality, complex and artificial in the highest possible degree. Let us take as a specimen the crystalline lens, or hard central part, of the eye of a cod fish, which is a perfectly transparent, and to all appearance homogeneous, spherule. No one, unaccustomed to explore the wonders of nature, would suspect that so simple a body, which he might suppose to be formed of a uniform material cast in a mould, would disclose, when examined under a powerful microscope, and with the skill of a Brewster, the most refined and exquisite conformation. Yet, as I shall have occasion to specify

more in detail in its proper place, this little spherical body, scarcely larger than a pea, is composed of upwards of five millions of fibres, which lock into one another by means of more than sixty-two thousand five hundred millions of teeth. If such be the complication of a portion only of the eye of that animal, how intricate must be the structure of the other parts of the same organ, having equally important offices! What exquisite elaboration must those textures have received, whose functions are still more refined! What marvellous workmanship must have been exercised in the organization of the nerves and of the brain, those subtle instruments of the higher animal faculties, and of which even the modes of action are to us not merely inscrutable, but surpassing all our powers of conception!" — Vol. I. pp. 59, 60.

Not the least interesting and useful portion of this work, is that which is devoted to the description of the structure and functions of those animals which occupy a place at or near the foot of nature's scale. Many of these are such as come under our common observation, and occasionally excite our particular attention, but concerning which we are very ignorant, and sometimes feel our ignorance to be rather uncomfortable. Such is the *Asterias*, or Star-fish, of which there are several species, but which is not a fish at all. Such is the *Echinus*, or Sea-urchin, or Sea-egg; and such is the *Actinia*, or Animal-flower, both of which genera have also several species under them. How often these are seen, — how often they are taken up in the hand, — how little is known of them. Nay, it is not an uncommon idea, that, because these things are apparently so insignificant, no one has ever taken the trouble, — we believe that is the expression, — *taken the trouble* to examine them, or write about them, or find out where their place is in nature, — if indeed they have a place, and are not anomalies and outlaws. Then there is the *Medusa*, or Jelly-fish, which we see floating and flapping in the water when the weather is calm, or lying helpless on the sand as the tide recedes; has that ever been examined or described? They have all been examined; they have all been described; they have all a place assigned to them in the ranks of creation; they have all a use and office. Their construction is known, their motions have been analyzed, the manner in which they take their food, and the process by which they digest it, have been traced by accurate observation; and a sketch of all this may be found, in a popular and intelligible form, in the treatise before us.

They all belong to the *Zoöphyta*, the fourth and lowest great division of animated nature; but, low as they are, they are not beneath the care of God. He who made us, and placed us in the rank which we occupy — alas! how do we often occupy it? — made them, and placed them in the rank which they occupy, and gave them their share of work and enjoyment.

Who that has ever crossed the Atlantic, has not seen at times in pleasant weather, the rainbow hues of that light little mariner, the Portuguese Man-of-War, as the sailors call him? We have heard it called, by those who aimed to be more correct than the sailors, the *Nautilus*, and they have thought that in seeing it, they have seen the far-famed *Nautilus*. But the sailors are the more accurate party by far. They call it the Portuguese Man-of-War; — and who have a better right than they to name the creatures of the sea? They do not rob another creature of its classical appellation, to bestow it on one to which it is altogether unlike. Though they are not naturalists, except in their own way, they have generally seen something of the world, the “watery world” in particular, and they know that a Portuguese Man-of-War is not a *Nautilus*. The scientific naturalists confirm their decision, and tell us that this animal, which they call the *Physalia*, belongs to the same division of the *Zoöphytes*, with the creatures already mentioned, while the *Nautilus* ranks among the *Mollusca*, in the second great division of animated nature; and that consequently there is about as wide a difference and distance between the latter and the former, as there is between a duck and a butterfly. The following is Dr. Roget's brief but pretty description of the *Physalia*.

“A construction still more artificial is provided in another family of the same order, denominated the *Physalida* or *Hydrostatic Acalephæ*. They have attained this latter appellation from their being rendered buoyant by means of vesicles filled with air, which enable them to float without the necessity of using any exertion for that purpose. The *Physalia*, or Portuguese Man-of-War, as it is called, is furnished with a large air-bladder, of an oval shape, placed on the upper part of the body; and also with a membrane of a beautiful purple color, which, as in the *Velella*, serves as a sail. These *Zoöphytes* are met with in great numbers in the Atlantic Ocean, and more especially in its warmest regions, and at a considerable distance from land. In calm weather they float on the surface of the sea, rearing their purple crests, and appearing at first like large air-bubbles, but

distinguishable by the vivid hues of the tentacula which hang down beneath them. Nothing can exceed the beauty of the spectacle presented by a numerous fleet of these animals, quietly sailing in the tropical seas. Whenever the surface is ruffled by the slightest wind, they suddenly absorb the air from their vesicles, and, becoming thus specifically heavier than the water, immediately disappear, by diving into the still depths of the ocean. By what process they effect these changes of absorption and of re-production of air yet remains to be discovered. Other genera, as the *Physophora*, have several of these air-bladders; but in other respects resemble the ordinary *Medusæ*, in having no membranous crest." — Vol. I. pp. 196, 197.

Much has of late years been discovered concerning the *Infusoria*, that wonderfully minute class of beings which has been brought to view by the powers of the microscope. Some kinds of them are so small and so numerous, that it has been computed by Professor Ehrenberg, the chief explorer in this region, that in a single drop of fluid there may be contained five hundred millions, about the number there is of human beings on the face of the earth. It has been ascertained that there are many distinct and permanent genera of these animalculæ; and such has been the perseverance of the abovenamed naturalist, that in their inexpressible diminutive bodies have been verified by him the processes of muscular action, circulation, and digestion! From the abstract which Dr. Roget has given of these discoveries, we take the following account.

"The Infusory animalcules, or *Infusoria*, were so named by Muller, a Danish naturalist, from the circumstance of their swarming in all infusions of vegetable or animal substances which have been kept for a sufficient time. They are, in general, far too minute to be perceptible to the naked eye: it is to the microscope alone, therefore, that we owe our knowledge of their existence, and of the curious phenomena they present: yet even the best instruments afford us but little insight into their real organization and physical conditions. On this account it is extremely difficult to assign their true place in the scale of animals. By most systematic writers they have been regarded as occupying the very lowest rank in the series, and as exemplifying the simplest of all possible conditions to which animal life can be reduced. *Monads*, which are the smallest of visible animalcules, have been spoken of as constituting 'the ultimate term of animality'; and some writers have even expressed doubts whether they really belong to the animal kingdom, and whether they should not rather be considered as the elementary molecules of organic

beings, separated from each other by the effects of chemical decomposition, and retaining the power of spontaneous, but irregular and indeterminate motion. It was conceived that all material particles belong to the one or the other of two classes; the first, wholly inert, and insusceptible of being organized; the second, endowed with a principle of organic aptitude, or capability of uniting into living masses, and constituting, therefore, the essential elements of all organization. According to this view, all vegetables or animals in existence would be mere aggregations of infusory animalcules, which gradually accumulate by continual additions to their numbers, derived from organic matter in the food: so that the body of man himself would be nothing more than a vast congregation of monads!

"This bold and fanciful hypothesis, devised by Buffon, and recommended by its seductive appearance of simplicity, as well as by the glowing style and brilliant imagination of its author, has had many zealous partisans. The new world, which was disclosed to the wondering eyes of naturalists by the microscope, abounding in objects and in phenomena of which no conception could have been formed previously to the invention of that instrument, was peculiarly calculated to excite curiosity, and to inspire the hope of its revealing the secret of the living principle in the arrangement of the atoms of organic bodies. During the greater part of the last century, infusory animalcules were the subject of frequent and laborious microscopical research, and gave rise to endless conjecture and speculation as to their origin, their vitality, and their functions in the economy of nature. Notwithstanding their minuteness, considerable differences of organization were perceived to exist among them: but many naturalists still clung to the idea that monads, the most diminutive of the tribe, and whose very presence can be detected only by the application of the highest magnifying powers, are homogeneous globules of living matter, without organization, but endowed with the single attribute of voluntary motion: and even this property was denied to them by some authors.

"All these fanciful dreams have been dispelled by the important discoveries of Ehrenberg, who has recently found that even the *Monas termo* is possessed of internal cavities for the reception and the digestion of its food; and who has rendered it probable that their organization is equally complex with that of the larger species of infusoria, such as the *Rotifera*, in which he has succeeded in distinguishing traces of a muscular, a nervous, and even a vascular system." — Vol. I. pp. 183–186.

The method, by which Ehrenberg arrived at his singular conclusions, is thus stated in another place.

"Ever since the discovery of the animalcula of infusions, naturalists have been extremely desirous of ascertaining the nature of the organization of these curious beings; but, as no mode presented itself of dissecting objects of such extreme minuteness, it was only from the external appearances they present under the microscope, that any inferences could be drawn with regard to the existence and form of their internal organs. In most of the larger species, the opaque globules, seen in various parts of the interior, were generally supposed to be either the ova, or the future young, lodged within the body of the parent. In the *Rotifer*, or wheel animalcule of Spallanzani, a large central organ is plainly perceptible, which was by some imagined to be the heart; but which has been clearly ascertained by Bonnet to be a receptacle for food. Muller, and several other observers, have witnessed the larger animalcules devouring the smaller; and the inference was obvious that, in common with all other animals, they also must possess a stomach. But as no such structure had been rendered visible in the smallest species of infusoria, such as monads, it was too hastily concluded that these species were formed upon a different and a simpler model. Lamarck characterized them as being throughout of a homogeneous substance, destitute of mouth and digestive cavity, and nourished simply by means of the absorption of particles through the external surface of their bodies.

"The nature and functions of these singular beings long remained involved in an obscurity, which appeared to be impenetrable; but at length a new light has been thrown on the subject by Professor Ehrenberg, whose researches have recently disclosed fresh scenes of interest and of wonder in microscopic worlds, peopled with hosts of animated beings, almost infinite in number as in minuteness. In endeavouring to render the digestive organs of the infusoria more conspicuous, he hit upon the fortunate expedient of supplying them with colored food, which might communicate its tinge to the cavities into which it passed, and exhibit their situation and course. Obvious as this method may appear, it was not till after a labor of ten years that Ehrenberg succeeded in discovering the fittest substances, and in applying them in the manner best suited to exhibit the phenomena satisfactorily. We have already seen that Trembley had adopted the same plan for the elucidation of the structure of the hydra. Gleichen also had made similar attempts with regard to the infusoria; but, in consequence of his having employed metallic or earthy coloring materials, which acted as poisons, instead of those which might serve as food, he failed in his endeavours. Equally unsuccessful were the trials made by Ehrenberg with the indigo and gum-lac of commerce, which are always contaminated with a certain quantity of white lead, a substance highly deleterious to all animals;

but, at length, by employing an indigo which was quite pure, he succeeded perfectly. The moment a minute particle of a highly attenuated solution of this substance is applied to a drop of water in which are some pedunculated Vorticellæ, occupying the field of the microscope, the most beautiful phenomena present themselves to the eye. Currents are excited in all directions by the vibrations of the cilia, situated round the mouths of those animalcules, and are readily distinguished by the motions of the minute particles of indigo which are carried along with them; the currents generally all converging towards the orifice of the mouth. Presently the body of the vorticella, which had been hitherto quite transparent, becomes dotted with a number of distinctly circular spots, of a dark-blue color, evidently produced by particles of indigo accumulated in those situations. In some species, particularly those which have a contracted part, or neck, between the head and the body, as the *Rotifer vulgaris*, these particles may be traced in a continuous line in their progress from the mouth, through the neck, in the internal cavities.

"In this way, by the employment of coloring matters, Ehrenberg succeeded in ascertaining the existence of a system of digestive cavities in all the known genera of this tribe of animals. There is now, therefore, no reason for admitting that cuticular absorption of nutritive matter ever takes place among this order of beings. Whole generations of these transparent gelatinous animalcules may remain immersed for weeks in an indigo solution, without presenting any colored points in their tissue, except the circumscribed cavities above described." — Vol. II. pp. 92 – 95.

There is some difference in bulk between these little creatures, so ingeniously investigated, and the mighty whale, whose aorta, or main artery, "is larger in the bore," says Dr. Paley, "than the main pipe of the water-works at London Bridge; and the water roaring in its passage through that pipe, is inferior in impetuosity and velocity to the blood gushing through the whale's heart." But different as they are, in bulk and in organization, the monad and the whale, there is a chain, the links of which may be distinctly counted, which brings and binds them together; there is a grand and regular series, in which they, with all beings of earth, are included. In this series, man also, with regard to his animal nature, occupies a place. But not so with regard to his mental and moral nature. Here the chain is broken, here the series is interrupted, and man "leaves all other animals at an immeasurable distance behind."

"He alone," says our author, "enjoys in perfection the gift

of utterance; he alone is able to clothe his thoughts in words; in him alone do we find implanted the desire of examining every department of nature, and the power of extending his views beyond the confines of this globe. On him alone have the high privileges been bestowed of recognising and of adoring the Power, the Wisdom, and the Goodness of the Author of the Universe, from whom his being has emanated, to whom he owes all the blessings which attend it, and by whom he has been taught to look forward to brighter skies and to purer and more exalted conditions of existence. Heir to this high destination, Man discards all alliance with the beasts that perish; confiding in the assurance that the dissolution of his earthly frame destroys not the germ of immortality which has been implanted within him, and by the development of which the great scheme of Providence, here commenced, will be carried on, in a future state of being, to its final and perfect consummation."—Vol. II. p. 580.

Could we follow Dr. Roget through his connected course of exhibitions of divine workmanship in the structure of organized beings, and present to our readers instance after instance of the remarkable adaptations which have either come before his own observation, or which he has culled with great judgment from works of acknowledged authority, we should be sure of communicating both entertainment and instruction to those who have not seen his volumes; but for this we have neither time nor room. We cannot forbear, however, making one more extract from the work, taken from the chapter on the "Decline of the System." On our own feelings, after we had accompanied the writer in his descriptions of the rise, the development, and the various forms, uses, and arrangements of that system, the passage had an effect like the solemn catastrophe of a poem. But even apart from the connexion in which it stands, it will commend itself by its great beauty.

"The period prescribed for its duration being at length completed, and the ends of its existence accomplished, the fabric can no longer be sustained, and preparation must be made for its inevitable fall. In order to form a correct judgment of the real intentions of nature, with regard to this last stage of life, its phenomena must be observed in cases where the system has been wholly entrusted to the operation of her laws. When death is the simple consequence of age, we find that the extinction of the powers of life observes an order the reverse of that which was followed in their evolution. The sensorial functions, which were the last perfected, are the first which decay; and their decline is found to commence

with those mental faculties more immediately dependent on the physical conditions of the sensorium, and more especially with the memory, which is often much impaired, while the judgment remains in full vigor. The next faculties which usually suffer from the effects of age are the external senses; and the failure of sight and of hearing still farther contributes to the decline of the intellectual powers, by withdrawing many of the occasions for their exercise. The actual demolition of the fabric commences whenever there is a considerable failure in the functions of assimilation; but the more immediate cause of the rapid extinction of life is usually the impediment which the loss of the sensorial power, necessary for maintaining the movements of the chest, creates to respiration. The heart, whose pulsations gave the first indications of life in the embryo, generally retains its vitality longer than any other organ; but, its powers being dependent on the constant oxidation of the blood in the lungs, cannot survive the interruption of this function; and on the heart ceasing to throb, death may then be considered as complete in every part of the system.

"It is an important consideration, with reference to final causes, that generally long before the commencement of this

‘ last scene of all,
That ends this strange eventful history,’

the power of feeling has wholly ceased, and the physical struggle is carried on by the vital powers alone, in the absence of all consciousness of the sentient being, whose death may be said to precede, for some time, that of the body. In this, as well as in the gradual decline of the sensorial faculties, and the consequent diminution both of mental and of physical sensibility in advanced age, we cannot fail to recognise the wise ordinances of a superintending and beneficent providence, kindly smoothing the path along which we descend the vale of life, spreading a narcotic mantle over the bed of death, and giving to the last moments of departing sensation the tranquillity of approaching sleep." — Vol. II. pp. 622 – 624.

As the structure and functions of animals can hardly be spoken of in many cases, without some notice of their "history, habits, and instincts," which depend upon and grow out of their structure and functions, it was a difficult task for Dr. Roget to avoid interfering with the department assigned to his colleague, the Rev. Mr. Kirby. Considering this difficulty, he has kept within his own domain with praiseworthy exactness, and the two treatises will be found to throw light on each other. The reader who has well perused them both, will rise up no mean proficient, for general purposes, in the kindred sciences of natural history and natural theology.

Neither of these works, however, is calculated or intended to supersede "the unrivalled and immortal work of Paley," as Roget himself terms it. They are both much more methodical, in a scientific point of view, than Paley's, and in this respect superior to it; but, as a theological argument, Paley's has the advantage, in fulness, in precision, and in variety; and there is, besides, an idiomatic and easy stream of style running through it, a charm, a happiness about it, which make it universally popular and useful, and which entitle it to the name of "unrivalled and immortal."

F. W. P. G.

ART. II. — *De l'Influence des Mœurs sur les Lois, et de l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs.* Par M. MATTER. Paris. 1832. 8vo. pp. 475.

M. MATTER brings to the question of the reciprocal influence of manners and laws, proposed by the French Academy, an acute mind, a philosophical spirit, and extensive erudition. He succeeds in disengaging, and bringing forth to the light, truths of the greatest importance to the statesman and the philanthropist. The work before us is only a *résumé* of a larger one not yet completed. It is divided into four parts. The first part is taken up with general remarks on the question to be discussed, and on the sense in which the terms *manners* and *laws* are used by the author. The second part treats of the influence of manners upon laws; the third of the influence of laws on manners; and the fourth contains views and observations on the means offered by the reciprocal influence of manners and laws for the social melioration of nations.

The general facts, which, according to M. Matter, should serve as the basis of every political measure and of every species of legislation having for their object the glory and prosperity of nations, are these.

1. The influence of manners, — tastes, habits, customs, morals, on laws, and of laws on manners, is not always equally strong. It depends on circumstances, is variously modified, but it is always profound. Manners inspire laws, laws modify manners. Generally one is the copy, the expression, of the other. Sometimes, however, they are not in harmony. When

they are not, the social state is deranged, is in peril. But when the tendency of either is generous, moral, popular, and when the authority that directs them is the same, the danger of the conflict is not great. In opposite cases there is only disorder and revolt, or corruption and decline, in empires.

2. Manners exercise a stronger action than laws. They are anterior, they belong more intimately to man, are, so to speak, the man, the nations themselves. Laws come later than manners. They must necessarily resemble them, support themselves on them, and borrow from them their power. They have a strong and permanent authority only as they are recommended by established habits, dictated by general opinion, and sanctioned by the public adhesion. In this happy condition, laws give to manners the most august sanction, protect them, honor them, and assure them a salutary ascendancy in all classes of society.

3. Manners without laws lose their purity, fail in force and influence. Laws without manners are null. "In vain," says Socrates, "are the walls of the Portico covered with laws. It is not by decrees, but by principles of justice deeply imprinted in the hearts of its citizens, that a state is well governed."

4. In the progress of the moral and legal civilization of nations, sometimes the laws, sometimes the manners are found in advance. Here it is the developement of manners, there it is the developement of legislation, that precedes. But whichever may precede, one always gains by what the other gains. The progress of law always leads to a progress of morality or of the individual, and a legislation having at all times in view the moral interests of humanity, so far from being a chimera, is the only legislation deserving the name. Every other is insufficient, defective, pitiable.

5. Manners have a greater importance than laws, for the prosperity of empires. Where they are very bad, good laws are impossible. Without good manners the best laws have but a feeble influence, and are often inoperative or mischievous. Without good manners or without good laws there is no life for nations, and the corruption of both is the most active cause of their ruin.

According to M. Matter, to labor "to establish, preserve, and perfect the public morality is the most sacred duty of government." It should attach itself to the dominant senti-

ment, idea, tendency of a people, and direct all its laws to this end. This is the first means offered by the reciprocal influence of laws and manners for the social melioration of nations. The second means to be adopted to obtain the same end, is the moral and political education of the people, and the third, the education of the young. The first means will never be successfully applied without the other two. Education then, both of the people and of children, is in reality the only efficient means of all social, as it is of all individual, progress.

But there may be a question as to the schoolmaster. Who shall determine and impart the education? The king of Prussia has decided in favor of government. He has made himself the schoolmaster of his people, and is taking good care to educate them to be faithful to an authority which does not tolerate one particle of political liberty. In his hands, education, instead of being a means of social progress, becomes a means of preventing it. Despotism was never so politic before. It is turning the weapons of Reformers against themselves. In the hands of the Catholic Church, education would be made to uphold the popedom and prevent the increase of religious light and liberty. In the hands of our own government, it would be turned to the especial benefit of the opinions or interests of the party in power for the time being. For ourselves we have no great faith in the fitness of any government, nor of any constituted body, civil, political, or religious, to be charged with the education of the people or of children. All constituted bodies have, or are prone to imagine that they have, peculiar rights and interests, and these peculiar rights and interests will almost invariably preside over the education they command or tolerate.

But waiving this, no government, no government on earth, is qualified to determine the education to be given the people. The wisdom of government can never rise above the average of the wisdom of the individuals who compose it. Allow that these individuals, — which is far from being the fact in any country, — are the wisest and best men of the nation, and it by no means follows that they are qualified to decide, authoritatively, what ideas, what sentiments are proper for the people, or what instruction should be given to children. There are few who would not call in question their infallibility, and the expediency of giving up their own understandings to

theirs. No education can be complete, can be what it ought to be, that does not instruct both people and children in reference to the end for which man was made, and fit them to attain it. The destination of man and of society, and the means of marching steadily and straight forward towards it, are the subject matter of all useful education ; and surely it is no want of charity to say, that governments are in respect to these, at least, but very little in advance of the people. They need education themselves as well as the people ; and they must in fact receive theirs from the people, for the people always exercise a stronger action on government, than government does on them. Government, then, cannot be the school-master for the people, nor for children. It may, as it is in duty bound, make all the provision for the education of both that it can, but it must not attempt to decide what the education shall be.

But it is necessary that both people and children be rightly educated. The education of the people is even more important than that of children ; for it is their education which decides the character and measures of government, and determines the education of the young. The importance of educating the young, the rising generation, is, in this country at least, widely and deeply felt. We allow, we contend, that all children should be well educated, and we have done and are doing much that they may be. But our own education, so far as relates to ideas, sentiments, to that which constitutes the soul of our education, will be the measure of that we give to our children. Allow that we of the present, acting generation, have incorrect notions on the destiny of man and of society, that we do not rightly perceive and fully comprehend the true end which man in his individual and social acts should always keep in view, and it would evidently follow that we are not qualified to instruct dogmatically those who are to take our places. The education we give to our children must be incomplete, erroneous, if not mischievous. Not a little of the education received by a large portion of the children of our country, is perhaps only better than none. We need but look into a multitude of tracts and sabbath-school books, which are constantly issuing from the Orthodox presses of the country, to be convinced of this fact. Those tracts and books educate, to a certain extent, our children ; but they educate them not for their true destiny, not for the future, but for the

past. Now, there is no remedy for this, but in the education of the grown-up generation, but in having the people possess right ideas on the destination of man and of society, in having them clearly perceive and fully comprehend, so far as it is given to finite beings, what man and society may be, and what they ought to be.

We would not have it understood by these remarks that we wish to relax exertions for the education of children. We believe with the Spartan lawgiver, that "the principal part of legislation is the right education of youth," and with a wiser than he, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." But this we contend is impossible, unless the people themselves know the way in which he should go. It is vain to ascribe this knowledge to any great extent to the people of any country. Enlightened as we think ourselves in this country, we do not fully possess it. Our notions on what education should be, are vague and contradictory. If our own government were qualified to determine for us, its determinations would have no weight. Some want their children educated to be Calvinists, some to be Catholics, some to be Episcopalians, some to be Methodists, some to be Universalists, some to be Unitarians, and some to be believers in no religion. In this case the most government can do is, so far as its own schools are concerned, to disregard the wants of all parties, and prohibit all sectarian and, as things are, virtually all religious instruction; which is, in fact, prohibiting instruction in what it most concerns us to know.

This evil is a great one. It is beginning to be widely and deeply felt. But there is no remedy but in the education of the people. The education of children has long held a prominent place, but the education of the people has not till lately received much direct attention. Neglected it has not been, but it has not been provided for and pursued systematically, designedly. It has seldom been presented as a distinct topic of consideration, and as an indispensable prerequisite to the right education of children. But we think it highly important that it should be. Let the people be educated, that is, let them have just ideas on whatever can affect man as a moral, religious, or social being, and they would soon devise and carry into effect the proper education for children. Ideas are not powerless. They may operate silently, slowly, but

in the end they prove themselves omnipotent. They pass from mind to mind, from heart to heart, and generate a moral force, that breaks out eventually with irresistible energy and changes the whole face of society. Just ideas are what is needed. The most important service which man can render his fellow beings is to diffuse just ideas on the destiny of man and society. To do this is to educate the people ; and when the people are truly educated, enlightened, a sound and vigorous national and individual morality will not be slow to follow.

But the question now recurs, Who are to be the educators of the people? Not governments, we have decided, because they need to be educated themselves. We want the influence of a body of men from which both governments and people shall receive their character. Where is this body to be found? We answer, unhesitatingly, it ought to be found in the Christian Ministry. The Christian clergy are designed to be the chief educators of the people. They act directly on the ideas of the people. They are concerned with every sphere of man's duty, with that which relates to his neighbour and society, as well as with that which relates to himself and to his God. They are the schoolmasters for adults, "public teachers of piety, religion, and morality," as they are denominated in our "Bill of Rights," and it is their mission to give lessons on whatever affects man as an individual or a social being, for time or for eternity.

In pronouncing the Christian clergy the educators of the people, we would not be understood as claiming for them the right to teach dogmatically. The question of the destiny of man and of society is not yet settled, and, till it be, instruction should be as little dogmatic as possible. The clergy, no more than governments, are infallible. There are few of them who do not need instruction themselves. They must inquire rather than dogmatize. They must educate by arousing and directing the attention of the people, by revealing to their minds their unexerted powers, and pointing them to the means of individual and social progress not yet adopted. They must study to set the people to work in the right direction, and educate them by inducing them to educate themselves. They are to act on free minds, and that not to control them, but to quicken and strengthen them. They must convince, not dictate ; persuade, not compel.

But we may be told that the clergy are doing all this now. Not all of it. They seem to us to restrict themselves to one part, — an important part, we admit, — of their mission. They seem to consider that the individual element is the only element of religion, and that that element is mainly important simply as it relates to another world. They confine their mission too exclusively to what is technically called the “cure of souls,” and seem to think that they should depart from their duty, if they should labor for the social well-being of man in his present mode of existence. They interpret in a wrong sense the words of Jesus, “My kingdom is not of this world,” so as to make them mean, not that the moral kingdom of Jesus was to be based on principles wholly different from those on which were based the moral and political kingdom of his epoch, but that he really intended to establish no kingdom except for the world after death. This world, society and all its direct interests, they seem to imagine to belong of right to some other class of instructors. The consequence is, that they give no direct instructions on the destination of society, do little to awaken a zeal and quicken exertions for social progress. They aim indeed to perfect the individual, but not society. In this they overlook the social, if we may so speak, the material elements of religion.

Now, we affirm that Christianity was designed to aid social as well as individual progress; and if so, the clergy have no more right to overlook the social element, than they have to overlook the individual element. Undoubtedly the first concern of Christianity is to perfect the individual, to fit him for that glorious social state into which the good will enter after death; but it contemplates also the fitting of him for a more perfect social state here. The angels sang “*On earth*, peace and good will toward men,” as well as “Glory to God in the highest.” It was on earth that Jesus proposed to establish a kingdom of righteousness and peace, as well as in the world after death. And, indeed, so far as he gave us any instruction on the subject, he taught us that the surest pledge of a heaven hereafter, is the creation of one here. In perfecting the individual, reference then may be had to his earthly mode of being. That mode of being comes within the precincts of the clerical mission. If it does, we know not why the clergy have not a right to touch upon society, point out social abuses, what society is, what it may be, what it ought to be, what are the

means of its progress, what man has a right to demand of it, and what it in return has a right to exact of him.

Allow, however, that the perfection of the individual is the sole object of Christianity, this subject can never, to any considerable extent, be obtained without the perfection of society. Man has his social side, social faculties, duties, rights, and interests. Leave out these, and his character will want symmetry, fail in completeness. Perfect every individual, and undoubtedly you would perfect society; but it is necessary that the perfection of both be carried along together. Out of society, in a cave or cloister, a part of man's nature must remain undeveloped, or be developed but to wither and die. Man can live and grow only in society. His growth effects a growth of society, and that growth of society reacts upon him and effects a new growth. But, in some states of society, there must be a social growth before there can be, — in relation to a part of the community, — an individual growth. Many individuals may occupy a position in the social state that precludes the possibility of the growth of any part, except the animal part, of their nature. These individuals never compose the whole of any community, but their number may be great. Of themselves they cannot rise. The man within them cannot germinate and spring up and expand into beauty or ripen into moral worth, unless watered and cherished by those who occupy a more favorable position. Society bears them down, tramples them in the dust; and may not the clergy urge their claims, and urge them even in loud and earnest tones? May they not point to the imperfections of that social state, where multitudes of human beings, endowed with a noble nature, are by the action of causes which exceed their energy or power to control, doomed to live and die mere animals. And in pointing out these imperfections, may they not direct attention to the discovery and application of a remedy? If they may not, how can they labor successfully for the perfection of all the individuals composing a community?

But it may be objected to this, that it would carry the clergy from the *actual* to the *possible*, from what is to what ought to be. We hope it would. The church from its beginning has been strangely inconsistent. In relation to the individual it has always been going from the actual to the possible, from what is to what should be. It never tells the sinner his actual condition must be preserved, that he must indulge in no vision-

any schemes of improvement, that innovations are dangerous, and that it is safest not to depart from the old landmarks. But it always attempts to make him discontented, and feel that his condition is most miserable. And it presents him, too, visions of a better state, and urges him by motives attractive as heaven, and terrible as hell, to gain it. In relation to society all this is changed. Here the actual is approved, and departure from it condemned. "Undoubtedly, indirectly, by softening the manners, exalting the sentiments, decrying or abolishing many barbarous practices, the church has powerfully contributed to the improvement of man's social condition."* But directly it has done nothing. It has done worse than nothing. It has generally given its aid to despotism, lent its spiritual ægis to shelter the civil tyrant in his war against the progress of society. Why this difference? In the most favored parts of the world society is imperfect, and its imperfections must in the eyes of a just God excuse many of the imperfections of individuals: why not then labor to perfect it? What, indeed, is the great mission of life, but to go from the imperfect to the perfect? And can it be less Christian to go from the imperfect to the perfect in relation to society, than it is in relation to the individual?

It may be alleged, that, should the clergy bring out the social element and labor for the perfection of society, they would soon lose themselves in a land of shadows, and merely amuse the people with dreams. Be it so, then. Even dreams are sometimes from God. Those visions of something better than what is, which are for ever coming to the minds and the hearts of the gifted and the good, are our pledges of a higher destiny. They familiarize us with loftier excellence, enchant us with a beauty superior to that of earth, and quicken within us the power to do and to endure every thing to realize them. They may never be realized. It may be best that they should not. But the soul's struggles to realize them always make us stronger and better. We envy no one who has them not. No one ever attained to eminence who did not see mountains rising far above the highest he could reach. There flit before the "mind's eye" of the greatest masters in painting and sculpture, forms of beauty which infinitely surpass their skill to transfer to the canvass or the marble. The immortal sons of

* See on the influence of the Church, Guizot's "*Moderne Civilisation en Europe. Leçon vi.*" Paris: 1828.

song have visions of intellectual greatness and moral worth, of which even their happiest numbers can give us but a faint conception. Yet it is to their daily and nightly communing with these beings of the ideal, to their continual efforts to seize and embody them, that they are indebted for the excellence they attain. It is, in fact, to the soul's power to go off from the actual to the possible, to conceive something greater and better than what is, that we are indebted for all our improvements. The soul goes before the body. It seizes upon heaven while its clog of clay drags upon the earth. It is well that it is so. It is the condition of all progress. Let the soul then be ever breaking away from the present, seeking a serener heaven, a warmer sun, and greener fields in the future; it is but its effort to return to God, of whom it carries with it, wherever it goes, an inward sentiment and an undying love.

Of course we would not lose sight of the practicable. But where does the practicable end? Till the limits of thought be discovered, and the depths of love be sounded, no one can tell. Man has within him powers which have slept from creation; and who is prepared to say what he may not achieve, when they shall be once awakened and put forth in all their energy? Certainly we would not lose ourselves in the ideal, nor indeed do we think there is much danger of doing it in this materializing age. There may be epochs when men are too much engaged in building castles in the air, and in peopling them with the creatures of their own imagination. But ours is not one. We are too much engrossed with the outward, the tangible, the material, to be in much danger of losing ourselves in the ideal. We say, then, let the clergy bring out the social element of Christianity, and direct their attention, and that of their congregations, to the work of perfecting society. Let them take generous views of what society ought to be, and of what it may be. And if they turn out to be dreamers, let them not lose their self-respect. We would rather dream with Plato, than reason with Hobbes and Machiavelli.

We trust we shall not be misinterpreted. We are not urging governments to attempt to realize the crude projects of mere day-dreamers. We are among those who are willing that government should move "slowly and surely," never departing from a settled line of policy without urgent and satisfactory reasons. We are not now speaking of the duty of governments, but of the clergy as educators of the people. In

the education they give, we would have the clergy connect the present with the future. We would have them educate the people with special reference to progress both in the individual and in society. We would have them preach the progress of humanity and of society, progress in the spiritual and in the material order, turn all minds and hearts towards it, convince them of its practicability, and kindle a deep and becoming enthusiasm to effect it.

If, however, we may be our own interpreters, we would not have progress preached to the detriment of order. We yield to none in our love of order. Order is heaven's law. But order, except in a very incomplete sense, is nowhere as yet attained. Disorder now reigns in the individual and in the social state; and this is the reason why we desire progress, which, if it be progress and not retrogression, is only a continued approach to order, a continued effort of man and society to place themselves in harmony with the universal order which is God.* Nor would we have progress so preached as to arouse angry feelings. We want no indignation, no condemnation. Jesus Christ came not to condemn the world, but to save it. The *Christian* ministry can follow no example but his. It will indulge no bad feelings itself, and it will avoid as much as possible the arousing of any in others. Love is the dominant principle of all good education, whether for old or young; and love is the lever with which the clergy must raise man and society to their destiny.

In contending that the clergy should labor more directly for the melioration of society, than they have hitherto done, we by no means forget the excuse, if not the justification, of their past conduct. It is easy to perceive the reason why this world has entered so little into their instructions. Christianity was like "leaven" deposited in the mighty mass of religious notions generated by the Grecian and Oriental worlds. For a time it must be concealed, and seem lost; and it was only after ages of silent and secret working, that it could succeed in leavening the "whole lump." Those religious notions, which Greece and the East had given the world, must therefore for a long time be predominant; and the history of the Church proves that they did reign for a long time, and that some of

* See "Mélanges Philosophiques, par Théodore Jouffroy." Paris: 1833. Article, "Du Bien et du Mal."

them have been very powerful down to our own times. The Grecian world was indeed human, material, social. But its religion was from the East, from Egypt and India, and there all is mysticism. Not all, perhaps, but mysticism predominates there, — gives its character and direction to men's thoughts, feelings, and pursuits. From them mysticism passed into the Church, sometimes reigned, or nearly reigned in it, and at all times tinged its doctrines and exerted an influence over its practice.

Now what is the view which mysticism gives us of this life, of this world? In the eyes of the mystics, this world is not worth a thought or a wish. The earth is a "wretched land," unable to "yield us any supply." Sublunary bliss is impossible. Man sees around him only the spectacle of sin and misery. His life is a continual warfare. He obtains not a morsel of bread, not a covering for his body, without a war with matter. Nothing is obtained without an effort, and all effort must end in fatigue, and generally in disappointment. Man's condition here is that of punishment. Every thing is opposed to his well-being. The body with its wants, society with its importunities, its petty ambitions, its vain pursuits, its friendships, its sorrows, its temptations, its vices and crimes, are for ever interposing between the soul and its good, rending it away from God, and compelling it to sigh and seek in vain for repose.

With this view of man's earthly mode of being, how could the thought of laboring for it find admittance? Life was death, and society the grave. We were not placed in this world to live, but to endure. It is not our home. We are strangers and sojourners here. We are pilgrims, seeking a city whose maker is God, as though God were not the maker of this as well as of all other worlds. Here all is toil and fatigue; and what would we have religion to be but a star of hope to guide us over "life's tremulous ocean," to the haven of everlasting rest, to our eternal home, where all our toils will be over, where there will be no more fatigue, where the soul may repose for ever beneath the sun-light of the Lord? What is life, what is the world, that they should detain us here? Scorn them, — deny them, — think only of heaven, only of gaining a blissful "mansion in the skies."

This view of life, of this world, of the true object of pursuit, though it has never completely triumphed in the church, has always made the grand staple of its sermons, exhortations, prayers, and hymns. With this view, it would hardly seem a

duty for the clergy to labor for the melioration of society. And this view is not without some show of truth. It is true that we can in this world obtain only a part of the good promised us by our nature, and it is true that we gain nothing without effort, and that all effort is followed by fatigue. All this is true. But, if we cannot obtain all the good our nature promises, we may obtain a part of it; if we cannot achieve our destiny here, we may commence it and march towards our end.* If we can obtain nothing without effort, it is in effort that we grow, in effort that the soul is developed and becomes strong and healthy. Repose after toil is sweet, but endless repose were endless death. Give to the soul perfect rest, and you annihilate it. Action is its life. And for action this world is fitted. It has its pains and its pleasures, its joys and its sorrows, its hopes and its fears, its struggles and its rests, its alternations of light and darkness, every thing needed to touch the soul on every side, to quicken and exert all its faculties. It is then rather a state of trial than of endurance, — of discipline, and not of punishment. It need not be condemned. It is useful to the soul. It is God's world, and to slight it were to fail in reverence to God.

The New Testament also in some places seems to favor this view of the mystics. But it is only in appearance. It condemns worldly-mindedness, but worldly-mindedness can hardly be confounded with the philanthropic desire to make the world the abode of peace and love. It forbids us to expect happiness from the world, but not to hope and labor for it in the world; it assures us the earth cannot yield us a supply, but not that no supply can be obtained while we are on the earth. It requires us to mortify the body; yet it does not mean that the body has not its place, its rights, and its uses, but that we should not be governed by its propensities, that we should yield ourselves servants only to our higher, our spiritual nature. It teaches us that our main effort should be to gain heaven, but heaven may be here, in a degree, as well as hereafter; that our only good is in God, but God is on this

* We refer our readers for a fuller developement of the views offered in this and the two preceding paragraphs, to Professor Jouffroy's "Cours [for 1833 and 1834,] de Droit Naturel. Cinquième Leçon. Système Mystique."

side the grave as well as on the other. He is in every good man's heart. He is found only in being good and in doing good. We may be good in this world and for this world, and do good for this world, without in the least unfitting ourselves for another. Man has a destiny on earth, in time as well as in eternity, and the path that leads to his destiny here is the true road to that hereafter, for both are but one and the same destiny. If he has a destiny here, he has duties here, and if duties here, the world is not beneath his notice.

While, however, the notion prevailed that this world is but a place of punishment, while it was considered an enemy, life a wearisome load, and heaven after death the only thing worth laboring for, the clergy could not preach and act much otherwise than they did. There was then no place for the social element. If they had brought it out, it would have been unheeded. The state of society itself, during the centuries which immediately succeeded the introduction of Christianity, was such as must almost inevitably turn men's minds in the direction of mysticism. Every thing was unsettled. There was nowhere any security. All was fleeting. The earth seemed abandoned by its Maker to the merciless hordes of barbarians that overrun it. There was no faith in it, no heart to labor for its improvement, and no cause to wonder at the thousands of monks and anchorites who filled the deserts and monasteries.

But this state of things is now changed, and the clergy must change with it, or lose their influence, and be themselves numbered with the things that were. The clergy, no more than governments, can have any authority without attaching themselves to the dominant sentiment or idea of the people. The secret of their influence is in their being the best representatives, impersonations, of the sentiments of their age and country, or of those on whom they are to act. The dominant spirit of their epoch is their *point d'appui*, which must cover and support all their operations. The history of the clergy since the Reformation, affords lamentable proof of the truth of this assertion. Before the Reformation, the church was hardly called to preach social progress. The spiritual order then was every thing, the material order nothing, except as it served the church. Man was something, but society was not. Individual progress might then be preached, but not social progress. The time had not yet come. The Reformation

changed the face of things. It was in many respects the installation of society. It brought up the state, and prepared the way for the social element to become operative. This was a new state of things. The clergy should have accepted and conformed to it. As men, some of them did ; but, as clergymen, the greater part rejected it and continued to pray, sing, and preach, in the spirit of the church before the change had been effected.

And what has been the consequence? Its consequences have been, in the first place, to lessen the influence of the clergy, till in those countries in which social progress has been the greatest, it is now almost too trivial to be named ; and, in the next place, to throw the direction of the social progress into the hands of those whose enmity the Church had aroused, and whose minds were imbittered against religion itself from its supposed hostility to social reform. It is therefore, that infidelity is so prominent a feature in modern civilization. The social element, being refused by the clergy, was taken up by unbelievers ; and, in proportion as the social element gained upon the individual element, unbelievers gained upon the clergy. And their gain has been great. In literature, perhaps we do not hazard too much in saying the infidel sentiment reigns. Scarcely a writer who takes a wide and deep hold upon the public mind, but seems to owe his success to his sympathy with doctrines generally disavowed by the clergy. Religion and society are at war. To a great extent the clergy adhere to the progress of humanity alone, while the opponents of the clergy are clamorous for the progress of society. Exceptions we know there are, but we are speaking merely of dominant tendencies ; and what we say of these was, perhaps, much truer at the close of the last century than now. Since then the influence of ministers of religion may have been on the increase. But their increased influence must be traced to the fact, that since then they have labored much more for society than they ever did before.

We say to the *fact*, and we say it designedly, for we do not perceive that there has been any material change of theory. The principle contended for is the same as it was. Social melioration, except in a theological sense, as it is to be effected by proselyting and converting, does not seem to be yet allowed by the clergy generally to be a Christian object, any more than it was before the Reformation. The energy,

which would have been directed to the improvement of society properly so called, has been beguiled into an apparently social channel, but it will soon discover that it is not yet in the right channel, and then, if the clergy do not accept it, they are prostrate. The real dominant sentiment of our epoch is that of social progress. It is in vain to war against it. The clergy, during their centuries of labor for individual progress, have prepared the way for it. It has come. It will have its day. It will reign till the progress of society equals that which has been made by individuals. It should be accepted. To accept this is what we are urging upon the clergy. We believe it their duty to accept it, and we are confident that to accept it is the only means they have left to recover their influence and save the world from infidelity.

We say the dominant sentiment of our epoch is that of social progress. We think we cannot be mistaken in this. If the developement and growth of the social element be not the dominant sentiment of the age, we would ask, what mean these demands for social reform which come to our ears on every breeze, from every land? What mean these movements among the people, these combinations of even workingmen to meliorate society? What mean these shakings of thrones, these fears, which penetrate the hearts of kings, fill courts with consternation, and make those who live by existing abuses turn pale? There is no mistaking the spirit of the times. We see it everywhere, we see it in new sects, in the abortive attempts of the Saint-Simonians, in the new French Catholic Church, insignificant as it may be. We saw it in the deep sensation produced by the whimsical Owen, when he first announced his new social system; we felt it in the thrill which ran through our hearts, and heard it in the loud burst of sympathy which broke from the whole civilized world, at the news of the French Revolution of July, 1830. We see it in the influence of such writers as Jeremy Bentham, Byron, and Bulwer. We see it, and not the least plainly, in the humble but powerful ministry to the poor in *this* city as well as in some others. All these and a thousand other circumstances, we could mention, had we room, are proofs to us, that men's minds and hearts are busy with the social state, and that the real sentiment of our epoch is the sentiment of social progress. To this sentiment the clergy must attach themselves. The time for star-gazing has gone by. They must look on the

earth, and exert themselves to make it the abode of peace and love. This is the only way in which they can recover a permanent influence, and be widely and lastingly useful. They neglected to accept the social element, when they might have done it to better advantage. That element is now mainly in the hands of laymen, and to a great extent in the hands of men who either disavow or do not love religion. In their hands it is abused, it takes a tinge of infidelity, receives a character and a direction foreign to its nature. The clergy should now be instant to redeem their past neglect, to recover and accept the rejected element, to cultivate it and give it a religious direction. By so doing they will recover their influence, so far as they ought to recover it, and be again in men's minds and hearts, with power to lead them up to God.

But, in contending that the clergy should take up the social element, we would by no means have them neglect the individual element of religion. Both are elements of Christianity, and both are responded to in the deep sympathies of human nature. They should be united, carried along together, as mutual friends constantly assisting each other. We believe in no social progress, that is not demanded and sustained by individual progress. But the latter cannot reach perfection without the coöperation of the former. Therefore we advocate the progress both of humanity and of society. Nor would we have a heaven after death neglected. That is our everlasting home; it is only then that we shall be able to finish our destiny; and, in thinking more of that portion of our destiny which may be accomplished here, we would by no means think less of that which will always remain to be accomplished hereafter.

O. A. B.

ART. III.—1. *The Morning and Evening Sacrifice; or, Prayers for Private Persons and Families.* Seventh Edition. Edinburgh and London: 1831.

2. *The Last Supper, or Christ's Death kept in Remembrance.* Edinburgh and London: 1828.

3. *Farewell to Time, or Last Views of Life, and Prospects of Immortality, including Devotional Exercises, a great Variety of which are in the Language of Scripture,—to be used by the Sick, or by those who minister to them.* Third Edition. Edinburgh and London: 1829.
4. *The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life.* In Three Volumes. Edinburgh and London: 1830.

It is not our intention to remark, particularly, on all these works. We have arranged them together at the head of this paper, for the purpose of introducing and recommending them in general terms to our readers; for, though they have been received with much approbation abroad, they are, we believe, but little known in this country.

It is the less necessary to advert with much particularity to the first three of these works, as they are pervaded by the same spirit, and are, in fact, illustrations and aids of the same general design that is more fully detailed in the last, namely, "*The True Plan of a Living Temple.*" This contains the fullest exposition of the author's views on practical religion, and it is to this that our remarks will be principally confined. He himself remarks;—"This treatise, though the last that has appeared, is intended, however, to take place as the first of the series;—the arrangement of the different treatises, according to their objects and uses, being as follows: First, the *Living Temple*, as a guide to active and social duty,—next, the *Morning and Evening Sacrifice* for daily devotions,—then the *Last Supper*, for assisting those who are preparing to celebrate the most interesting solemnity of the Christian faith,—and, lastly, the *Farewell to Time*, for the use of those who either have the near prospect of leaving this world, or who may wish to be useful to persons in that situation."

Indeed, works which are strictly devotional in their character, or which are intended to be merely instrumental in the great work of spiritual advancement, seem to us to claim a peculiar exemption from strict critical analysis. They partake too much of the retiredness and solemnity, which belong to the intercourse of the soul with God, to be canvassed in open day, and weighed, as it were, in the scales of the market. The unconcern with which the usual public devotional services are

often regarded, and the flippancy with which they are frequently spoken of, are, to our minds, not less shocking as a matter of sentiment, than they are mournful as a moral phenomenon. It is enough for us that they answer, in any good degree, the great design they were intended to subserve. Do they give a fitting utterance to the often vague, but sincere and earnest aspirations of the soul, touched with a sense of its religious wants? Do they serve to express, and, in expressing, deepen, a sense of its religious responsibility?

We think that the devotional works before us possess this merit in a very considerable degree. They are pervaded with a spirit of enlarged, comprehensive, and enlightened piety. They possess the great negative merits of being free from all parade and prettiness of phrase, metaphysical jargon of creeds, insincere self-humiliation, verbiage, and consecrated cant; and not unfrequently breathe forth that deep tone of sincerity, which goes directly to the heart, and to which all hearts respond. And, if these volumes be read, in the spirit in which they ought to be read, they will not need our or others' praise. After all, every thing, almost, depends on the state of the recipient mind; since the slightest word, nay an infant's sigh, that falls upon the devotionally prepared heart, may be more potent in its religious influence, than all eloquence of language; and, without this response of the religious affections, an angel's voice would be powerless, and a messenger from the dead, unheard.

With these remarks on the general character and claims of the three first-mentioned works, we take final leave of them, and now turn to the last, namely, "*The True Plan of a Living Temple*." This title, it is well known, has been preoccupied, and on this account it were well that some other had been substituted. But those who expect to find in this treatise any thing to remind them of the celebrated work of Howe bearing a similar title, will be greatly disappointed. They differ in all respects; in their plan, leading principles, in the theory of religion which they severally adopt, in their whole spirit and tendency, and still more, if possible, in their style and method of illustration.

The "*Living Temple*" of Howe partakes largely of those unfortunate peculiarities which marked the theological literature of the excited, troubled, and, in no small degree, the

benighted age in which he lived. A popular preacher of the Court and Parliament, in the time of the Commonwealth the chaplain and personal favorite of Cromwell, he made all his learning and all his rhetoric subservient to the technical theology that then prevailed. Unlike his cotemporary Jeremy Taylor, — that writer of all times, — he did not look abroad over creation, and through the providence of God, for those analogies and coincidences, which necessarily pervade the written and unwritten revelation of the same Great Author ; — unlike him, he did not listen, with attentive ear, to the myriads of voices that are continually speaking from the heavens above and from the earth beneath, to every contemplative and devout spirit, of truth and duty ; but, like the common tribe of the theologians of his day and generation, took it for granted that all saving knowledge was summed up within the dogmas of a cramped and narrow creed, of man's device. This was, of course, fatal to all true enlargement and illumination of his mind. And when we recollect, further, that the particular creed, which thus shut out all light except that which might serve to illustrate and gild its own darkness, was essentially Calvinistic in its tenor, we shall not wonder that the writings of Howe, and the "*Living Temple*" among the number, find at the present day, with all but some persons of his own religious caste, a very qualified acceptance. Indeed, with any but these, the principal recommendations of his voluminous productions, will be found to consist in the occasional power and beauty of their style, and in those strong and faithful appeals to the conscience, which, though founded on erroneous and belittling views of human duty and destiny, yet bear the impress of entire honesty and solemn self-conviction, and, therefore, fall on the heart in tones of power.

We speak of these traits as occasional. And we must use this qualifying expression, since, notwithstanding the indiscriminate praise which it has become sufficiently common to lavish on the style of the leading writers of that age, it seems to us, in many respects singularly infelicitous. It is beside our present purpose to enter here into any elaborate illustration of this remark. The strictures of our author on their manner of presenting their thoughts strike us as entirely just. They seem to have had no idea of a logical division of a subject, or that there were such things as a beginning, middle, and end of it. They divided and subdivided it by a process, which

seemed to have no limit, but that imposed by the exhaustion of their ingenuity, and the failure of their power of analysis. The consequence is, that their most elaborate treatises lie before us as a mass of slightly connected fragments, and though the separate parts may present some salient points, and reflect, in their disjointed state, some prismatic hues, yet they are greatly wanting in oneness and entirety of effect.

Again, most of the theological writings of that age are essentially controversial in their character. Those of Howe, however, are a delightful exception to this remark ; for though bound, as we have said, by the hard and close fetters of a technical faith, he was not, as is generally the case, so fretted and galled by them, as to impair the sweetness of his own pious nature, or make him ready to "call down fire from heaven," or bring up that from below, to consume those who honestly differed from him in opinion. He was too great and good a man, moreover, to love controversy for its own sake. But he could not, we think, claim an entire exemption from another besetting infirmity of the writers of his time. We refer to that poor parade of learning, which led them to fill up their pages, and crowd their paragraphs, with quotations and references, relevant and irrelevant, congruous and incongruous, almost without measure or end, which give them the appearance of being more ambitious of displaying their own reading than of communicating solid knowledge to their readers. They appear to have had little idea of that refined scholarship, which, like true dignity of manners, is discoverable in the general air and bearing, or indicated by indirect or unconscious allusions, rather than by an elaborate and painstaking display.

These brief remarks on the general character of the writings of Howe, apply to his treatise, the "*Living Temple*" which called them forth. And in all these respects, it stands opposed to the book before us bearing the same title, of which we are now to give some account.

Of the theological character of this work we scarcely know how to speak. We gather from hints scattered through the volumes, that the author, who is anonymous, is a clergyman of the Established Church of Scotland. And when we remember that the creed of this church is bristled all over with the thorniest points of the old Geneva school, we find it difficult to reconcile the fact with the prevailing religious views

of the book, which are large and liberal, and still less with its pervading tone, which is merciful and bland. There is, we apprehend, scarcely a single doctrine peculiar to the "Standards" of the author's professed faith, that is not brought into question or falsified by the positions, reasonings, and general strain of his book. We are aware that he admits in terms the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, but expressly says that they are not to be received "in any sectarian sense"; that they "should not be moulded into the systematic shape of doctrines, but considered as addressed to the heart and sentiments of men." He quotes very largely from the "Light of Nature," implies that he too belongs to the "family of the Searches," and apostrophizes the author, who we suppose is not considered a particularly sound Calvinist, in the line,

"Euge! tu mihi eris magnus Apollo."

He regards *David Hume* as being "by far the most accomplished metaphysician of modern times, — perhaps of any time," and considers the "Treatise of Human Nature" as the "one source" whence has flowed the "two modes of philosophizing that are at present most prevalent in the world, or that divide the philosophical world between them, — the Scotch and the German;" which we deem to be *rather* an heretical opinion. After describing "Mysticism, Asceticism, Fanaticism, Dogmatism, Superstition, and Enthusiasm," as "degenerate varieties of the religious disposition," he hesitates not to say, in so many words, that "Fenelon was a mystic, — all the monks were ascetics, — Howe had a strong tinge of the fanatic, *Calvin was the Prince of Dogmatists*, — the Romish clergy have been great patrons of superstition, and Bunyan, and Swedenborg, and Wesley, and — some others whom we don't care to mention, but who stand high in the public view, — are notorious specimens of enthusiasm." He maintains that the "origin of evil" is a phrase which has no meaning, except as embodying an abstract idea that the mind forms for its own convenience. He holds that no man is utterly worthless, but that, perhaps, good predominates even in the worst character; and he reprobates the doctrine of final reprobation. In the "Farewell to Time," he more than questions the doctrines of a "sudden conversion," and that all mankind are, either here or hereafter, to be divided into

two great classes. And, finally, in referring to certain "indications of a fanatical spirit," considers them as "exhibitions, from fact, of the miserable effects which are produced by narrow, and gloomy, and mistaken views of religion, and of this grand truth, that the only religious views which are fitted to keep pace with the order of nature and the great arrangements of society, must be of a *liberal*, and *cheerful*, and *enlightened cast*."

Now, however we may be disposed to assent to the correctness of these sentiments, we do not see how they can be honestly entertained, or consistently avowed by one, who, as a condition of being admitted to the sacred office of a Christian minister, and holding his place as such, must have formally given his assent to, and made public profession of, such articles as the following, which we copy from the constitution of the Scotch National Church.

"Do you sincerely own and believe the *whole Doctrine of the Confession of Faith*, approved by the General Assembly of this National Church, and ratified by law in the year 1699, to be the truths of God, and do you own the *whole doctrine* therein contained, as the confession of your faith?" The confession of faith here spoken of is the "Westminster Confession," together with what are called the "Larger and Shorter Catechisms," which are ordinarily bound up with it. This form of subscription is required even of the *lay* elders of the Church, and it is mournful to think that the author of the Waverley Novels, and multitudes of others, whose spirit and faith are as little Calvinistic as his own, have given in their public and solemn adhesion to it.

The author before us, in addition to the above, as a Probationer of the Scottish Church, before receiving license to preach, must have given, according to law, an affirmative answer to this question:

"Do you renounce all doctrines, tenets, or opinions whatsoever, *contrary to*, or *inconsistent with*, the said doctrine?" — that is, the Confession above mentioned.

Again: — as presentee to a recent parish, in the solemn act of ordination, in the face of the congregation, he must have assented to the following:

"Do you sincerely believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith [that is, the Westminster Confession above spoken of] to be founded on the word of God; and do

you acknowledge the same as the confession of *your* faith; and will you *firmly* and *constantly* adhere thereto, and, to the *utmost of your power*, assert, maintain, and defend the same?"

"Do you *disown* all Popish, *Arian*, *Socinian*, *Arminian*, *Bourignian*,* and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions, whatsoever, contrary to, or *inconsistent* with, the aforesaid confession of faith?"

It is an exceedingly unwelcome task thus to note the discrepancy between the avowed sentiments and the solemn and publicly professed faith of an author, in other respects so consistent and right-minded as the one now before us. We are aware, too, that it is the legitimate result, if not the necessary consequence, of the system which requires this imposition of creeds and formularies of faith. They are, and must, in the nature of things, often prove to be snares to the consciences of good men, while they do nothing to secure the purity of the church against the access of the unscrupulous. We are aware too of the extremely loose morality which prevails among professed Christians on this point. The author who has called forth these remarks is kept in countenance, at least to a great degree, in thus solemnly professing what he does not believe, either in letter or spirit, by such men as his countrymen Robertson, Blair, and the great body of the liberal party of the clergy of Scotland, whose opinions, it is well known, lean strongly towards Arminianism. He is kept in countenance too in this by great numbers in England, on the continent, in our own country, including professors of our Theological Institutions, and in all other places, where these creeds and confessions are imposed. But the commonness of the sin only renders it a more fitting subject of reprobation. We know, too, with what cunning pretences and ingenious glosses men endeavour to excuse to themselves this tampering with their solemn protestation;—how they talk of "signing for

* It is somewhat singular that Antoinette Bourignon, should have found more proselytes in Scotland than anywhere else. One reason may be, that in many respects, as, for example, in her views of the freedom of the will, the doctrine of election, the unchangeable love of God, the forms of worship and formularies of faith, her opinions were vastly more rational and Scriptural, than those imposed by the National Church.

substance," and of "articles of peace," and of "not being able to keep a conscience." But all this is a poor mockery. Does not every child, in any of the lower classes of a Sunday School, know, that assenting to a creed, either by word or act, directly or indirectly, is assenting to the import and meaning of that creed; and that this import and meaning are that, and nothing else or less than that, which its language plainly expresses, and which it is understood to express by all parties concerned? And if a man assent to this with any mental reservation whatsoever, does he not thereby, and to the same extent he does so, falsify his settled convictions and act a deceiver's part? Is it not a deception moreover, and a voluntary one too, in regard to the most sacred of all subjects? But what is meant by "signing for substance?" "substance" of what? substance of the creed? that is, as we have said, what the creed is understood and known to mean? — or is it the "substance" of something that is neither understood or known in the signer's mind, or something that is known or understood to be very different from the plain import of the creed? And as to signing creeds, as "articles of peace"; is it not a plain matter of history that these very creeds and confessions of faith have, again and again, proved to be nothing but sources of alienation, war, and bloodshed? And then, again, as to "not being able to keep a conscience;" we should like to be informed, what a Christian man *can* afford to keep if he cannot keep this? — Is it his place? his pulpit? his professorship? his standing in society? And if so, shall he be permitted to keep them by a subterfuge in religious matters, which if perpetrated in the common business of life, would jeopard his character for common honesty?

But, abominating as we do every thing even approaching to indirectness in the concerns of religion, we are yet willing to believe that there are cases, where this disingenuousness, to give it no harsher name, may be nothing more reprehensible than one of that numberless class of deceptions which men practise on themselves. It may, sometimes, be a species of unconscious compromise which a well-intentioned mind makes with a bad faith, between what it thinks it *must*, but knows not *how* to believe; — between a form of faith, hallowed it may be with all the ineffaceable associations of our early homes, and a questioning state of mind, dissatisfied with itself, and verging onward towards a brighter light and manlier self-avowal. We

all know, too, or may, or ought to know how difficult a thing it is to the best of us, "to read our own consciousness without mistakes," and to give to even a rational faith, a living, forming, realizing power. But still, after making every charitable allowance for thus professing one thing and believing another, we must think, as we have said, that there is a strange apathy prevailing even in good men's minds in respect to this sin, and it is quite time, therefore, in regard to this, as Coleridge says on another point, that the "word *duty*" were sounded "in the ears of this generation."

But in reference to the author before us, however difficult it may be to reconcile the pervading tenor of his book, with his adherence to the Established Church of Scotland, with her forms and articles, we would not only gladly acquit him of all suspicion of disingenuousness, but are happy in commending, as worthy of all praise, the largeness and comprehensiveness of his views, his enlightened piety, and the open, free, benignant, and truly catholic spirit with which they are laid before us. To whatsoever sect he may belong by profession or by subscription, in all these respects we claim him as our own. And we welcome these volumes, and the favorable reception they have met with in their own country, as auspicious tokens, that the creed, which Knox transplanted from Geneva to the sterner soil of Scotland, and which the Covenanters watered with tears and blood, and which was afterwards, by public authority, fenced round with the Westminster Confession of Faith, is undergoing a meliorating process, and that from the combined influences of a better nurture, a kindlier exposure, and a more genial warmth and light, its fruits are losing their native acerbity and bitterness, and becoming, at once more palatable and more nutritive.

The object of the work before us is thus stated in the words of the author ;

"As, therefore, in the Author's former treatises, it was his object to give a just direction to the *devotional feelings* of men, — and to found these upon *natural* and *human affections*, — so in the present, it has been his endeavour, by adherence to the same general plan, to give a corresponding character to the moral and religious ambition of mankind ; — in the favorite words of the Saviour, — to bring 'the kingdom of Heaven upon earth ;' and to teach religious men, that the serious thoughts which have been awakened in their minds, can only be really gratified,

and are only directed towards their proper objects, when they are employed, not to lift the imaginations of those who cherish them into a state of listless abstraction, or of enthusiastic rapture, — but rather, when they are so happily managed as to lead the aspirant after heaven to look with a warmer, a nobler, and a *more religious* interest on every thing on earth, — to be thankful that God has thus enabled him, by the due management of a definite trust in time, to prepare himself for a greater trust, when the kingdom of God shall be more fully disclosed, — and to believe, that it is simply by the manner in which he conducts himself amidst present interests, that his future station in the universe shall be determined." — pp. xii., xiii.

The following the author considers as the *distinctive features* of the work, subordinate to the general purpose now mentioned ;

"The view which he has given of the *extent* of the Divine kingdom on earth, and of the *means* employed by Providence for the extension of that kingdom ; — next, the reasonings which are submitted to the reader respecting the proper meaning and use of the term *perfection*, and of the idea which it expresses ; — then, the account given of the proper nature of those services which are *more strictly religious*, and of the place occupied by our religious feelings in the general structure of human nature ; — still farther, the place assigned, in the same structure, to the power which man possesses of forming notions of *ideal* excellence, and the distinction between this power, and that of aiming at what is more vaguely and commonly called *perfection* ; — also, the account given of the importance of attending to *small duties*, in our attempts to make real progress in the 'way that leadeth unto life ;' — and, finally, the picture of a 'good life,' with which the work is concluded, and which the Author hopes has been so managed, as at once to present a clear conception to the minds of his readers of a style of conduct which every one of them is in a condition to realize, and also to admit into this their training for immortality, the most *common* duties and interests of life." — pp. xiv., xv.

In the following account of the circumstances in which the plan of the treatise was first sketched, our readers will recognise a deep tone of sincerity and self-abandonment to his theme on the part of the author ; and on these accounts, if on no other, will be predisposed to lend him a willing and candid attention.

"Of the confidence which the Author has in the truth of the principles by which the present work is characterized, and

in their subserviency to the best interests of mankind, the reader may judge from the following statement:—

“The work was sketched, its principles settled, and the whole plan of their connexion formed, at a time when the Author had little expectation that he was again to be permitted to take an active part in that living scene, the duties of which he has endeavoured to describe,—and when, with no view certainly of literary distinction, nor any care about literary honors,—but with an earnest desire to ascertain the duty actually assigned to man on earth, he busied himself,—with that deep anxiety which is known only to those who believe themselves to be bidding ‘farewell to time,’—in endeavouring to find out what is the object really proposed to man as a subject of the kingdom of God, and how far he himself had succeeded in acting conformably to that object.

“No length of days can ever efface from his mind the remembrance of that bright summer noon,—made more bright and infinitely more affecting by the thought, that such brightness might be seen but for a little,—when, being incapable of more active exertion, he sketched with his pencil, in the open air, and amidst the blossoms and overshadowing foliage of that ‘cottage garden’ which had been dear to him from infancy,—the whole series of views and principles which, in a more finished form, but with no alteration whatever of their original design, he now submits to the judgment of the public;—indeed all subsequent reflection and investigation have but served more deeply to impress him with the conviction that these principles are in strict agreement with the order of Nature, and with the arrangements of Providence;—and he has, accordingly, only to add, that, having made this statement, he cannot doubt, the reader will give him entire credit, when he declares, that he now offers the work to the public with the solemn belief, that the principles which it contains are in accordance with the purest truth,—and that their adoption, as rules of conduct, would indeed make man ‘a Living Temple,’—or, to use the fine words of the Divine Teacher, would bring ‘the kingdom of Heaven upon earth.’”—pp. xxv. — xxvii.

It will at once be seen, from this sketch of the “distinctive features” of the work before us, that it will be impossible to bring them into view, even in an outline, within the limits allowed to this article. These “features,” however, are all more or less palpable manifestations of a few first principles; and these in connexion with the general “plan” of the treatise, we shall attempt to lay before the reader, with such

illustrative remarks of our own, as, from their relative importance, or from any other cause, they may seem to demand.

But we are embarrassed with a difficulty of a peculiar kind, even at the very outset, which constitutes, so far as manner is concerned, one of the principal objections to the book. It is the diffuseness and dilution, both of thought and expression, that pervade it. The leading object and plan of the author are plainly enough, and quite often enough, brought into view, and there is, we believe, no real deficiency in oneness and logical completeness in the system, as it existed in the mind of the author ; but there is a want of distinctness and prominence, both in the elementary principles, and in their connexion with each other, and with the final result, as laid down in his three volumes. We are reminded by contrast, oftener than we could wish, of that old and excellent rule of all good writing,

“*Denique sit quidvis simplex duntaxat et unum.*”

And this, however singular it may seem, arises from excessive efforts to make himself understood. Instead of exposing himself to the difficulty spoken of by Horace, that of becoming obscure by laboring to be brief, he becomes obscure by laboring to be clear. The mystery wrapped up in the sententious saying, “*Never over-explain,*” seems always to have been a mystery to him. He appears not to have learned the import of the rule, “*Do and have done,*” and painfully illustrates how hard the latter is to do. If we may be permitted to use the illustration, he sometimes reminds us of those much-enduring animals, who being placed on a rotary surface, for the purpose of turning machinery, are constantly struggling onward, and seem to themselves, doubtless, to be advancing at a quick pace, but, deceived by their delusive foothold, remain, all effort and no advance, much in the same spot, all the live-long day. Or, (if we may add another illustration without exposing ourselves to the fault we venture thus to indicate,) in reading these volumes we are often in the condition of those who, having embarked on shipboard under a serene sky, with a favoring breeze, with the sails all set, and the course well ascertained, may seem to be making good head-way ; but find, to their deep and blank chagrin, when they come to take an observation, that a treacherous under-current has been continually carrying them back towards the point of their departure.

And now that we have hinted at one exception, which, in

our critical capacity, we have felt ourselves obliged to take, we may as well perhaps finish at once all that we have to say of the same ungracious character, that we may go on unimpeded to give some account of this, on the whole, very good and not innutritive book.

Connected with the fault just alluded to, is another of a not dissimilar kind, which attaches to the style of these volumes. This is too much amplified. The sentences are much too long and involved. They want, like the trains of thought, condensation and point. They are singularly deficient in what rhetoricians call a *periodic* structure; that is, they do not terminate where the meaning stops; or, in other words, they are loosely put together. We arrive at what we suppose to be the end of one, and where an end is plainly indicated, and then find that we must enter on another, and so on, in long succession, until the mind becomes weary and lost in a sort of impatient bewilderment, instead of being put, as is doubtless intended, in fuller possession of the author's thought. All definite points and bearings of the prospect, intended to be opened upon the view, are merged in the gentle undulations of the surface. We are reminded, as we read, of a remark of Mr. Sydney Smith on the conversational style of Sir James Mackintosh: "Though his ideas were always clothed in beautiful language, the clothes were sometimes too long for the body, and common thoughts were dressed in better and longer apparel than they deserved." The author, as appears from his Preface, adopted this very mode of writing, partly for the sake of perspicuity, and partly that he might avoid "that false and inflated diction that has now become so common, — which has been chiefly fostered and diffused by the multitude of 'periodical works' that are at present in circulation, — but which is essentially so disgraceful to the taste of any age that favors it." Both objects are good. But we much doubt, in respect to the first, whether perspicuity is ever gained by this looseness and prolixity of style. Sentences which thus "drag their slow length along," never *tell* on the mind of the reader. On the contrary he is very liable to forget absolutely, or to retain only a sort of hazy recollection of what was said at the commencement, when he reaches their close. Thoughts when thus diluted become feeble. They are too much attenuated to reflect light. They do not in consequence, shine out like the constant stars, by their own inherent brilliancy, or ar-

range themselves like them into definite shapes, and leave a distinct image on the mind, but by being spread, like comets' tails, over a large surface, present only a dim, evanishing, and ill-remembered outline. And in respect to the other evil which the author so earnestly eschews, namely, "the false and inflated diction diffused by the multitude of 'periodical works' that are at present in circulation," this is undoubtedly one of the crying literary sins of our time; but is there no happy medium between this attempted intensity of expression and straining after effect, and a tame and wearisome, however decorous and dignified, dilation and prolixity of style?

There is a less objection than this, which we shall just advert to in passing; and this is, an extremely redundant use of certain *pet* expressions of the author; such as, "fine," "luminous," "opened," "opening up," "fragmentary," and "fragmented," which occur *passim* throughout the volumes. This, though of not much importance, except as it shows a negligence on the part of the writer, and consequently the want of a proper respect for his readers, had been better avoided.

And may we gently hint another objection which has been forced upon our notice? We mean the *rather* over complacent estimate, which the author himself appears to have of the author. He thus considers and speaks of many of the leading principles of his books as "original," and as needing in consequence to be presented in much detail, and with reiterated repetition. Thus in his preface he says, (p. xvi.) "he had important principles to make familiar, — almost to *introduce*, — to his readers." Again, (at the commencement of the second volume,) he observes, certain speculations of his "will probably be found to have awakened an *entirely new* train of thought in the minds of most of those who have submitted to the study of it." And, (in the same volume, p. 110,) he hopes "to present views as *novel*, but at the same time as *instructive* and *pleasing* as in the two former parts." Now, however "novel" these views may be to his readers within the pale of the Scottish church, we can assure him, that most of them will be recognised, as familiar and long-known acquaintances, by those who are in the habit of attending the churches, or reading the practical ethics, of liberal Christians on this side of the water. Besides, why not leave to his hearers to find out for themselves whether his "views" were "novel," "instructive," and "pleasing"? But this trait shows forth more vividly among the notes, appended to the third volume; the very insertion of most

of which betrays the want of proper deference to other minds above spoken of, being apparently mere undigested transcripts from his commonplace book. We quote in illustration of our meaning from the note marked SS., entitled "Queries proposed to the author by himself." After reminding the reader (lest he should mistake on this point!), that "they have nothing in common with those which are appended to the immortal work of Newton on light, inasmuch as they are not of doubtful solution, and to which he thinks himself in a condition to give a categorical answer, and after remarking that he is peculiarly free from being actuated by a desire of the applause of men, he goes on to observe: "Nature has fitted my mind, not so much for *opening up* new views, as for finding out, amidst the mixed alloy, the pure and valuable metal; and long practice in this art has given me considerable proficiency in it." And immediately subjoins his own estimate of this peculiar gift of his: "In my opinion, the *rarest* and *most valuable*, though not the showiest of all talents, is that which [thus] enables a man to seize the pure gold amidst all its alloys." Can we well avoid here the "windy suspiration of *unforced breath*,"—*Ohe! jam satis est!* Now, while we are fully aware that "many a gem of purest ray serene" is kept from the light that is necessary to reveal and manifest its beauties, by a want of proper self-opinion in its owner; and know also, that self-trust and a comfortable self-complacency, not to say self-conceit, constitute the very inspiration of many not ineloquent voices, that might otherwise have remained "mute and inglorious"; still we cannot but think, that it is well to keep up the appearance of diffidence, at least, in this brassy age, and, were it only for the effect of contrast, to "feign the virtue if we have it not." We have thus felt constrained to hint at these imperfections of the book because we wish to give an accurate idea of it to our readers. But now "*Paulò majora canamus*." And it is with great pleasure we proceed to lay before them what seem to us to be its leading principles, which are essentially true, and extremely important both to the happiness and improvement of man.

The seminal principle out of which most of all that is peculiar to the author before us is evolved, is his idea of the Divine kingdom, or that "kingdom of God" which it was the great design of the Founder of Christianity more fully to make known and establish among men, and for the extension of which he taught his disciples to pray, to toil, and to suffer.

As the idea of this kingdom is distinctive of this essay, so in its developement as therein given, it is grand, comprehensive, beautiful, and just. It is not so original, as we have already hinted, as the author seems to suppose, but we can point to no other book where it is so fully stated, so successfully carried out into its minute details, or so closely brought into contact with active life, in its various aspects. Our first object, therefore, will be to present as accurate a sketch of it as our limits may allow.

The author rejects the common notion, that this "kingdom of heaven" is a portion of the empire of God, from which all imperfection and defect are excluded; a spiritual state or condition in which only beings of spotless excellence and consummate felicity are found; while "earth is but an outcast department of the entire scheme of things, in which vice and misery exercise a paramount control." On the contrary, this "kingdom," in his view, is not entirely excluded from any portion of the universe where the principles of order or goodness hold even a divided sway; and, therefore, opportunity is still left, even amidst the darkness and apparent misrule of this present state of things, for the prevalence of purer principles, and finer knowledge, and more unmingled enjoyment; and it was the purpose of Christ, as the messenger of God for the moral regeneration of the human race, to give to all these blessings a wider range, and a more perfect operation upon the establishments of men, and thus to establish the kingdom of God in the hearts and minds and lives of his children here on the earth. In a word, as we understand the author, (for it is difficult to find such a simple, clear, strong, condensed, and yet accurately defined statement, as might be quoted as an illustration of his own views in his own language,) by the "kingdom of God" is meant a moral kingdom; a spiritual kingdom; the reign of righteousness; the sway of kind, and pure, and holy affections; the rule of just, and true, and high principles; the supremacy of elevated and ennobling sentiments; the ascendancy of the religious principles of our natures, which are of God, and lead to God, and make us partakers of the divine nature.

It is evident from this definition of the "kingdom" which Christ came to advance, that it is limited to no place, to no particular community of men, and to no definitely marked period of time. Consisting, as it essentially does, of a series of means to purify and ennoble the human soul, it is

adapted to all regions, to all the different families of the human race, to every successive age, throughout all time. It comprehends every thing in nature around us; the material world; the events of life; the peculiar circumstances of men; the private conflicts, trials, hopes, fears, and aspirations of our own spirits; all the directly religious acts and exercises of the soul; every thing, in short, that has a tendency to improve, in any way, the wide extent of the dominion of God, "as well as that higher order of occurrences, and more rare interposition of expedients, by means of which the interests of the moral and spiritual nature of man are carried forward."

This kingdom, being thus universal, is also one and the same. It consists not of various distinct and definitely marked divisions or jurisdictions. "If we could stretch our view over the whole order of things, we should perceive not separate compartments, governed by separate laws, and tending to different results, but one vast scheme, all the parts of which are in intimate and harmonious connexion. Nature, and providence, and grace, would then assume the aspect of one unbroken plan, all the portions and connexions of which, have a mutual influence upon each other." Indeed this universality of the divine kingdom in the sense explained, taken in connexion with this unity and harmony of all its separate parts, lies at the basis of all the author's reasonings in the treatise before us.

The means, it is obvious, by which this "kingdom" is advanced, are as vast and various as are all the different aspects under which it can be viewed. And the extent to which the author carries this thought will appear from the remark, that "every improvement, even on the face of material nature, is as real, though it may be not so important or influential an improvement of 'the kingdom of God,' as any amelioration of the condition or feelings of living and religious agents." In the same manner, and for a more obvious reason, all the Arts and Sciences, all political and civil Institutions by which the condition of life is improved; all that frees men from the Thralldom of his Passions and Vices; pure, refined, and liberal Tastes; the progressive Experience of life; the Maxims of the Wise; the Labors of the Good; one's own Introspective Search; Observation of Others; the Lessons of the Past; these, as well as Religious Acts, and those extraordinary and

miraculous Dispensations which are directly spiritual in their scope and aim ; every means, in short, by which knowledge and virtue, and order, and good hope are promoted, and the general condition of human nature is improved, are to be considered as promotive of the " kingdom of God," in the soul of man.

Having thus established and developed, at great length, this leading thought of his essay, the author proceeds to remark on the " Relative Powers and Conditions of Individuals in this kingdom of God upon earth." As this kingdom is confined to no place or time, so all nations, and all individuals, of whom nations are composed, even the humblest and meanest, even in the most obscure and trifling act, are conspiring, whether they are aware of it or not, to carry it forward. There is a difference of *Condition* and of *Function*, but no difference in *Inherent Duties*, and *Privileges*. There is no favoritism in the dealings of Divine Providence in this respect. And as all are necessary to each, and each to all, as all are made 'members one of another' by common wants, sympathies, social connexions, pursuits, objects, hopes, and fears, all and each are conspiring, even where they seem to be most engrossed with their own selfish and apparently separate interests, to advance the great purposes of the " kingdom of God " on the earth. We commend the whole of this section as suggestive of wholesome counsels to any, who may seem to themselves to be exempted from this great bond of mutual dependence by the accidents, so to speak, of rank, station, or wealth. Those, too, who are impatient of an humble or obscure lot in life, will find themselves taught, by the same train of remark, that they are as important " members " of the same great " body," as those who act more fully in the world's eye ; that the humblest act of the humblest individual may be as important in its connexions and results, as any which are chronicled in a nation's annals ; and " that there is no station so low, in which a mind sincerely bent on doing good, may not find opportunities of gratifying itself to the utmost of its virtuous ambition." And the discontented of all conditions may find some light flashed in upon their consciousness by the following remark. " In truth, we are commonly much more under the influence of vanity or selfishness, than of a sincere desire to be extensively useful, when we are actuated, at any time, by an intense desire to leave the station in which Providence has placed us."

Life, and the condition of life, with all its opportunities, powers, and capabilities, regarded as a portion of the kingdom of God, are next considered by our author as a *Trust*; not as a Gift merely, to be gratefully received; not only as a blessing to be innocently enjoyed; but as a Trust, for the use of which we shall be held responsible to Him who has put it at our disposal. This truth, familiar as it is, needs to be continually enforced; for, though one of the first that is suggested to the mind, it is one of the very last that works itself into men's practice. It is peculiarly proper to be introduced into a treatise on practical religion, like that before us. Perhaps few are sufficiently aware how deeply a sense of Responsibility is inwrought into the very nature of man; and fewer still of the extent of its application, and the solemnity of its import. It is a very superficial view of the Trust committed to us, to consider it as arbitrarily created by the religion we profess. It is indeed recognised, sanctioned, and enforced, and with an unearthly emphasis, by the great teacher of this religion. If he had left nothing on record but the "Parable of the Talents," we should have his whole mind on this subject. But it is also written on the soul; and we shall easily read it there, if we will only pause for a moment amidst our outward calls, and look in upon ourselves. Does not a capacity for improbability enter as an essential element into all our faculties and powers of every kind? Does not the word *duty*, or its equivalent, belong to all languages, and does it not find a response in all bosoms? Does not every man, who thinks soberly on the subject, feel that the mere preservation of the talent committed, whatever it may be, is only a species of unprofitableness? Is it one? Is it small? Think not, on either account, to bury it with impunity in the earth. However insignificant it may appear, it was deemed important enough by the Divine Disposer, to be intrusted to our keeping, and even the humblest, as the history of time is continually showing, may be the remote or proximate cause, or indispensable medium, of great results. At any rate, one thing is clear. However small our Trust may seem to be in comparison with others, it is yet *every thing to us*. If well improved, the object of life is secured; if lost, all is lost. How solemn a thing it is, then, to live, to be! If to the humblest of us can be fitly applied the, for once, simple and touching lines of Johnson, on poor Levet, it will be enough:—

“His virtues walked their narrow round,
Nor made a pause, nor left a void ;
And sure the Eternal Master found
His single talent well employed.”

The next general remark of our author on that portion of the “kingdom of God” which is displayed in this present world, is that it might be expected beforehand to exhibit, and does in fact exhibit, “*Peculiar Aspects.*” And the first of these presented is, human life considered as an apparently mixed, incongruous, and unfinished scheme. Perhaps no thought is oftener pressed upon all minds of ordinary seriousness than this, by the whole condition of this present existence. The inherent endowments, capacities, and aspirations of the human soul, which can find no answering developement on earth ; the thirst for happiness which all present enjoyments leave unsupplied ; the essential unsatisfactoriness of all aims, objects, and pursuits merely temporal ; the ever-unfolding revelations of truth, and the ever-onward call of duty ; the strange and deplorable confusion of events, viewed in themselves alone ; the blighting of pure and well-placed affections by death, or by the sadder visitation of unworthiness ; the sickness, suffering, decrepitude, poverty, and frequent friendlessness of the young, the innocent, and the good ; the utter, obdurate, and continually indurating selfishness, that a long course of prosperity is liable to create ; the disappointment of worthy efforts ; the apparently capricious bestowments of the gifts of fortune, as they are called ; the temporary success of sleek and smooth hypocrisy ; the immediate triumphs of daring, open, and all but avowed villany ; — these, not to extend the melancholy catalogue, are evidence enough, that the present life is not a complete and finished scheme. Every aspect of our earthly condition, taken in connexion with all that we believe of God as the moral Governor of man, shows that it is not, that it cannot be. We must deny the existence of any such being ; we must blot out of our minds every cherished trace of his moral attributes, every idea of his sovereignty and providence, before we can admit, for an instant, that the present life is the whole of life to man. But if we regard it, not as being such, complete in itself, but simply as a part, and an extremely small part, of the vast dominion of God, these seeming incongruities, this appearance of incompleteness, irregularity, and disorder vanish. They are then seen to be phenomena, that beforehand might

naturally have been anticipated. For every thing, in contemplating the condition and prospects of men, as our author justly observes, depends on the point of view in which we place ourselves. As, in looking upon any natural landscape from a low point of sight, objects appear to be scattered almost promiscuously in the distance, their relative magnitudes confused, a near horizon settling down upon the whole, and a scene, not unlovely it may be, but certainly without plan or order, is presented; while, if we look at the same prospect from a higher point of view, all that seemed before confused and out of place assumes a better regularity, and objects take their proper magnitude and true proportion;—so it is with the moral aspects of life. If we confine our view to those narrow limits that are just around us, and are terminated by the grave; if we look upon this mortal existence, so to speak, upon its own dead and dreary level, it presents a spectacle of imperfection, irregularity, and disorder; and the condition and destiny of men exhibit, not only a melancholy and disheartening scene of confusion, but a sad and inexplicable enigma. But, if we view life from a higher elevation than earth and time afford; if we regard it as we may suppose it is regarded by higher intelligences; if we view it, in any humble measure, as we may suppose it is viewed by God, that is, as a part of his universal kingdom, which is from everlasting to everlasting, which comprehends all space, all beings, in all circumstances, in all worlds; then seeming incongruities vanish away; then heavenly light is thrown in upon the gloomiest spots of our earthly pilgrimage; then even the “dark valley of the shadow of death” is illumined by rays of glory beaming from the “eternal city”; and man, earth, time, and all events, appear but as parts of one grand, beautiful, admirably adjusted, and perfect whole.

There are other aspects of life, considered as a part of the same Divine kingdom, presented by our author, to which we can only cursorily refer. Thus, it is plainly a part of the plan of Providence which is presented to our view, to “bring good out of evil.” Not only would the whole scheme appear perfect if it were viewed in its whole extent, but even what seems to be evil, in that part of it with which we are conversant, is seen, in many cases, to be a means of effecting a higher good than could be produced without it. And, as this is the fact in by far the greater number of examples in that part of the great

scheme which we *do* see, so it is fair to presume that the same rule holds on, and with more manifest and beautiful developments, in that part of the scheme which we do *not* see. Thus, for example, physical and moral evil, or the evil of suffering and the evil of sin, are frequently found to possess a recuperative and regenerating power, and in this way another gracious effluence of light is thrown in upon the present condition of man, considered as a member of the universal kingdom of God.

Again, that part of the great scheme, which is presented to our view, exhibits man to us in all places and under all circumstances, as laden with a *sentiment of guilt*; and at the same time it is so ordered, as to suggest to him the expectation of pardon upon true repentance, and continually to remind him that there is help and hope with God, if he will yet turn to him and live. The author very justly observes, "that perhaps the most characteristic and interesting of all the aspects, under which that portion of the kingdom of God which is manifested on earth presents itself to our view, is that of its being 'a kingdom of *Grace*,' that is, of mercy and pardon offered to a race of beings, whose minds are impressed with an indelible feeling of guilt, but who are also instructed by all just reflection on their own nature, and by all the arrangements amidst which they are placed, that the Being who formed them is full of pity for their infirmities, and that, viewing them with the forgiving eye of a father, he is anxious to aid them in all their attempts to act more conformably to their characters as his children." The wonderful coincidence of the Saviour's mission with these essential traits of human souls, and of the human condition, is very properly pointed out by the author in the same train of remark. It is, indeed, one of those many responses of the soul to the outward calls of the Gospel, which speak of the same divine original; to which thoughtful spirits are listening, more and more, all the world over; and which are gaining continually a new interest, and mutual authentication, in the same degree as we separate the pure and true words of Christ from human noises, and more faithfully interrogate and accurately note the promptings of our own consciousness.

Other aspects of life, thus considered as a part of the kingdom of God, are presented in detail, as for example, that it is a "state of continual change"; that it has a "dark as well as a bright

side," since God, in the necessary connexion between sin and suffering, shows himself a fearful avenger of evil; that no action in the moral, any more than in the natural, world is or can be insulated, or cut off from its connexions with its precedents and consequences; that these consequences of our actions invariably correspond in character with their parent source; that, whether good or ill, they spread indefinitely around us, — and are not checked or removed during this present life, but follow us into eternity. These, indeed, are all momentous topics, and, as treated by our author, can scarcely fail to suggest affecting and useful trains of thought; and with this remark we must dismiss them, that we may take up the remaining parts of the "plan" before us.

Having thus ascertained the "characteristic and luminous idea, which lies at the foundation of all our Saviour's practical views," namely, the establishment of that "kingdom of God" on earth, of which we have spoken so much at large, the next leading inquiry is, — What is the Object proposed to man, as the subject of this kingdom? We must be permitted to condense our author's reply to this question, as it seems to us, notwithstanding the value he seems to attach to the disquisition, to be much more elaborate and wire-drawn than is necessary, occupying, with its recapitulations and its affiliated topics, the whole of the concluding third part of the first volume. The answer to the question, what Object, that is, what aim or end is proposed to man, as a subject of the divine kingdom, is not, as is commonly said, *perfection*, in any absolute sense of the term, since this is necessarily a point to which he can never attain. But it is the unceasing *perfecting* of his nature. Simple as this distinction may seem to be, it is one that has been strangely overlooked. No term, perhaps, is in more frequent use with writers on morals and religion than that of "perfection," and there is none which is more meaningless, or at least more vague and fluctuating in its signification, so far as it may be said to have any. In an absolute and positive sense, man has not, and from his limited powers obviously cannot have, any idea of it whatsoever. As applied to God, for example, the only perfect Being, in this sense, we are all obliged to exclaim with the Psalmist, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." And the term, considered as standing for any ideal excellence, must obviously

vary with every different individual, and in the same individual with every different degree of his advancement. But, in the use which is commonly made of this term, this vagueness and indefiniteness are lost sight of, and it is considered as indicating something fixed and absolute, and is regarded as an ultimate end, which it is every man's duty to attain. Hence the confusion, both in thought and practice, that prevails on this point. But the perfecting of our natures, "forgetting the things which are behind, and pressing forward to those which are before," aiming and striving constantly after an excellence not yet obtained, regarding every advance really made but as a vantage ground for a still onward movement, progress, improvement, untiring, unceasing advancement, in one word, perfecting, making more and better all that we have, or are, or can do, — this is an end which *can* be understood, and the only "perfection" to which man is capable of attaining. It is a relative excellence, and not a possible and final acquisition. But what, meanwhile, is the Actual Duty, in the performance of which this desire of continual improvement is to be realized? This is the question at issue. Does this duty consist in abstraction from the world, more or less entire, more or less indolent, in dreamy meditation and wrapt musings about self-sacrifice, self-renunciation, and communion with God, and growing likeness to the divine nature? No; it is no play with moonshine like this. But it is the real, active performance of the real, actual offices belonging to that condition of life, in which, in the providence of God, we find ourselves placed. This is the especial trust that is committed to every individual man's stewardship. This is the particular furrow in the husbandry of human life, that it is made each man's duty to till. It is here, and here only, he can be rendered an effective, and useful, and loyal subject of the divine government. Every man by this precise sphere of duty, thus marked out for him, is distinguished from every other man who lives; and it is by faithfulness in this particular trust thus definitely assigned to him, in contradistinction to all the myriads of men of all times and of all places, that the ultimate purposes of the universal kingdom of God are, so far as his agency is concerned, to be advanced. He is to remember, however, several essential circumstances and considerations in the performance of this particular duty. Such, for example, as these: — that life is an ever onward-flowing stream, and that it depends, in consequence,

upon our conduct at every passing moment, whether or not we enter at an advantage on that which succeeds ; since there is no reflux wave, which will bear us backward to live over again lost time, and to redeem lost opportunities : and that hence results the obligation of watchfulness, prudence, foresight : — that, while each man's duty is thus definitely marked out by his condition, it insulates him from none, but makes him a co-laborer with all ; and that hence result the virtues of social, civil, and domestic life : — that it is very often a scene of suffering, as well as of active effort ; and that hence result the passive virtues of patience, fortitude, resignation, of cheerful acquiescence and of good hope in the providence of God : — and that, finally, man is not simply a corporeal and sentient being, but a spiritual, a moral, an intellectual being, above all, he is essentially, distinctly, and characteristically, and preëminently a religious being ; and has connexions, in consequence, which he can neither cast off nor sever, with a higher and invisible order of things ; and hence it becomes his duty, at all times, and in the humblest offices of his present condition, to act with reference to these high and ultimate connexions, in the full and cordial exercise of faith, and hope, and heavenly-mindedness. It is, moreover, further to be noted, that these duties are not to be performed, and these virtues exhibited, in a cold, constrained, or merely perfunctory manner ; but with these *dispositions of the soul*, which are necessary to give to them strong vitality, and the most fitting and graceful developement. These, thus carried into their appropriate expression in the life and conduct, are commonly called the "*Graces*" of the divine life. They are not, as they are commonly considered, "separate existences," but those "permanent expressions of sentiment and feeling with which external conduct is invested," and which give to it its life, and its beauty, and its charm. And, in the beautiful language of our author, "as they spring from the exercise of the highest and noblest of our powers, — those sentimental and prophetic powers which ally us most immediately with that invisible and mysterious world, of which all external things are but the visible signs, — they hence seem, wherever they reside in active energy, to give to the human character an expression of dignity almost above that of ordinary mortality, and to approximate it to the spiritual excellence of those subjects of God who have always "delighted to do his pleasure." We

commend the whole of this part of the work to our readers, as furnishing a favorable specimen of the author's powers of analysis and statement. It affords a very good example, also, of that exceedingly common, though little suspected, fallacy in all disquisitions of this kind, by which men mistake those *abstractions* and *generalizations*, which it is convenient or necessary for the mind to make and clothe in words for purposes of intercommunication, for real, substantial things. Thus what are called the "virtues" or "graces" are often spoken of as if they had a separate existence, and were not merely dispositions of the soul carried out into their appropriate manifestation. By a similar use of language, it is common to speak of man as a civil, social, moral, or religious being. What volumes of mysticism have been dreamed about an "interior and exterior life," "faith and works," the "internal and external man." But this distinction is entirely arbitrary. It is one of man's making for convenience of language. It is, moreover, altogether verbal. We have no objection to it, when this is understood. It is convenient, proper enough, and indeed necessary for purposes of minute accuracy, in moral disquisitions. But still it should always be kept in mind, that no man exists or can exist in a divided or fragmentary state, now in one portion of himself, and now in another portion of himself, or can commission these different portions to do, or forbear to do, certain things. But what a man does, is the act of the man, and of the whole man, and, the act being his, it must take its character from the motive which prompted the act. Is not this extremely plain? Why then will men, sensible and farsighted enough in common affairs, overlook this palpable fact? And why especially will moral writers, highly judicious in other respects, permit themselves to be deluded with merely verbal distinctions here? And, until we learn to keep this simple statement clearly and constantly in view, all our discourses about man and duty will be limited, embarrassed, and confused. Take, for example, the virtues or "graces" of faith, hope, and love, or any other of the lovely sisterhood; they are not, as, judging from the common language in respect to them, we might suppose, distinct and substantial existences; they are not qualities which can be superinduced upon a man's soul, laid upon or taken off from his character; but they are "*modes of conduct*," or "*styles of acting*," of the man himself, considered as one being, feeling and acting in a certain

definite way. It is one great merit of the volumes before us, that this fact is kept constantly in view, and they would be well worth studying on this account alone.

There is yet another important consideration, which must not be neglected when we say that it is the object of man, regarded as a subject of this "kingdom of God," to fulfil, faithfully and well, all the duties, little as well as great, of the place and station, in which, in the scheme of Providence, he finds himself placed. These duties, as has been already said, are to be done with all his powers and capabilities, with his entire nature. Now as he is essentially, emphatically, and characteristically a *religious* being, so it is his primal duty, not, as the common mistake is, to separate this part of his nature from the rest, and act in reference to it solely, but to do all he does, and be all he is, under the full influence of *religious* principles and sentiments. He should give to them their proper place in the scheme of life ; and, as their proper place is the highest, so they should always be the ascendant motives of his will, and rule with an unquestioned sway over his whole conduct.

But it is evident, that a being, thus inherently and peculiarly religious, ought, in accordance with this nature, to perform some services which are directly expressive of his religious sentiments and feelings, and of the connexion, in which these place him, with their Author and Object. What are these ? What are their nature, value, and comparative place among other duties ? These questions require to be answered, since it might otherwise be inferred from what has just now been said, that, provided a man fulfils the duties of his station in life, and fulfils them in a religious spirit, there is no need of any other Religious Services, and that they may, and indeed ought to be dispensed with, as idle or useless. The whole subject of those Services, commonly considered as strictly religious, is thus brought into view, and is treated by the author with great good sense, discrimination, and liberality. We must at this stage of our remarks confine ourselves to one or two suggestions, which seem to us to be particularly worthy of being noted.

It is common, even among enlightened men, and with writers of no humble name, such, for example, as the Author of the "Light of Nature" and Zollikofer, to regard these Religious Services as important and obligatory *solely* on ac-

count of the *good effects* which they are adapted to produce on those who perform them. In fewer words they are to be regarded as *means* only. This is considered, and very properly, as we think, a low and inadequate view of the subject. These "Divine or Religious Services," as they are called, are, it is true, means, and extremely valuable in reference to their effects; but this is not all that is true of them. They are proper and valuable also as direct expressions of the peculiarly high and nobly endowed nature, which we possess as religious beings; and he who neglects these services, therefore, not only neglects an important method of religious improvement, but he fails in the discharge of a duty, which, independently of all such effects, is imposed upon him by his religious nature. Though he avail himself, then, of all other means conducive to a pure and holy life, yet, if he neglect to cultivate and express, by religious exercises, his religious sentiments, he neglects to act according to the highest, sublimest, and most characteristic part of the nature God hath given him. He fails in his imperative duty as a pious man; — *he does not act as a religious being ought to act*. We commend this thought to the serious attention of our readers, and refer them to the work before us for many valuable applications of it, which our limits will not permit us to quote. We should be glad, too, to cite our author's remarks on the obligation of Public and Social worship, and his summary of the whole subject, for the especial benefit of that large and, we regret to say, increasing number of persons, in all our religious communities, who think it well enough for *society at large*, that God should be honored in Christian forms; and that, in consequence, it is expedient that churches should be built, and their doors be opened one day in seven; and that the minister, always and in all cases, whatever may betide him, should stand up in his place; but who, thinking *themselves* too good to need to be made better, and too wise to need to learn from such services, lend to them no constant, cordial, and efficient coöperation, and satisfy their consciences on this subject by excuses too frivolous to pass current in social life for a neglect of the slightest social courtesy.

There are some admirable remarks, too, as we think, "on the forms most suitable to religious services;" and they are particularly valuable as coming from an officiating minister of the Church of Scotland, to which we suppose the author particularly alludes in the following extract; and are, as we think,

equally applicable to the prevailing forms of Congregational worship among ourselves.

“Hence the services of some of these churches, having laid aside all the *ceremonial* character which in former times had gained such universal ascendancy, have become remarkable for the baldness and tameness of their devotional rites,—and men seek rather to model their understandings to certain abstract modes of thought, than to awaken or elevate their devotional feelings, when they frequent the place of public worship. It ought, however, to be kept in mind, that it is chiefly as a *sentimental* being, that man is fitted for the exercises of religion,—and that hence any form of worship which has no tendency to awaken his imagination or to expand his feelings, is defective in the very purpose for which all devotional exercises have been established.”

Nothing is clearer to our own minds, than that our public religious services might be greatly improved, by changing their literal, naked, bald character, for one which is more *suggestive* of devotional feelings. But we dare not venture on this subject beyond the limits of a single sentence.

Our remarks on the *third* and *fourth* Parts of the author's “Plan,” we must defer to the next Number.

ART. IV.—*Scenes and Characters illustrating Christian Truth. No. V. The Backslider.* By * * *. Boston : James Munroe & Co. 1835. 18mo. pp. 144.

As the essence of Christianity consists in its influence within, as it is “there that it must live or bear no life,” there is no mode by which the heart can be more deeply affected with its truths, than by living examples of their power and beauty, exhibited in human character and conduct. Next to this are such fictions as the one before us, which, by their faithful and graphic representations of human nature, affect us for the time like reality.

“The Backslider” is intended to illustrate the influence of Christianity on minds differently constituted,—particularly on the two principal characters of the story. In Anna Hope, we see its effect on a mind naturally well balanced. The mode

in which it develops and strengthens the understanding, elevates and enriches the feelings, governs without enslaving the judgment, confirms the authority of conscience, and above all imparts a moral courage and constancy, altogether higher and more effective than any which could be derived from mere human sources, (whether it be of reason, stoicism, or animal spirits,) is here naturally and beautifully set forth. The just measure, the simplicity, the reality of her virtue are revealed, as it were, not in a happy picture, but in the real specimen. In Walter, we see the good seed scattered on the thin soil; and it is the aim of the writer to show where the lack of root is,—to bring to light those secret agents which insidiously undermine the fair promise of ardent and ingenuous natures, and against which, therefore, it behoves such natures to be especially on their guard. The besetting sins of Walter's mind are vanity and the love of pleasure; and the gradual operation of these, in bringing down to the level of the worthless, a character which seemed destined, and was by the possessor himself fully believed to be destined, to overtop all around him, is finely delineated. An ardent and intellectual character; like his, is peculiarly susceptible of the inroads of skepticism; especially when it assumes the specious guise of reason, free inquiry, and universal philanthropy; and we are impressed with the responsibility, which the inquiring mind incurs, of keeping fully in view its own fallibility, and the truth of those first principles of moral and religious faith, which are indestructible and conservative elements of human nature. While we feel sure, that such a character as Anna's would stand firm amid the same temptations under which Walter's had fallen, we are not led into the erroneous conclusion that this is wholly to be ascribed to constitutional difference. We perceive that it is because Anna has *obeyed* the command to watch and pray, that the enemy finds her prepared and able to resist attack,—because she has *sought* the aid of the spirit, that its saving influences have been vouchsafed to her,—because she had less confidence in herself, and more reliance on God, than Walter had, that she too did not fall away in her hour of trial; and we are left with the conviction that this duty of self-distrust, and sense of spiritual need, were as much within the reach of Walter's mind as of Anna's, and would have saved him from the ruinous course into which he was drawn.

The story is distressing, and we have heard this mentioned as an objection to it. We should say it exhibited no small degree of dramatic power in some of its more affecting scenes, if the simplicity with which it is told, and the holy end it has in view, did not prove that no such purpose as dramatic effect was in the mind of the author. We cannot object to its melancholy, or as it has been called, "agonizing" close. In the first place, the moral required it; and in the second, it is true to nature. Such a character as Walter's, with such an education, such motives and attachments, could not give up virtue and religion, with a less severe struggle, or with consequences less distressing. We should have said, he could never have given them up under any temptations; but let him that standeth, take heed lest he fall. As we follow the steps of Walter's downward course, we see how naturally they proceeded; we see that he who relies on his own strength, who does not clearly admit, that of himself he can do nothing, can never be safe, and we lay the lesson to our hearts, humbly hoping to profit by it.

The author has not gone very deeply into the dark recesses of dissipation and infidelity. These subjects are rather slightly touched, and it may be thought that justice is not done them. A more full and able refutation of the arguments urged by infidels against Christianity would not have been out of place in this tale, although its object is to illustrate conduct rather than doctrine. We regret that something more cogent was not offered on the side of Christian belief; it is of use to bring forward such arguments in every connexion which may procure them attention. There are many persons, who desire to possess a clear understanding of the foundations of their creed, to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them, who, nevertheless, would not be persuaded to resort for such knowledge to the perusal of a dry work on theology. But, as to the scenes of dissipation which are presumed to have so large a share in corrupting the once innocent mind of Walter, we rejoice that the author was content to indicate their location, without revealing their contamination and horrors. They are scenes which imperfect characters and the merely innocent cannot look upon without danger; and nothing saves most minds from being corrupted by the description of them, but its being poorly done. One of the greatest faults in this tale, is the coldness of Anna's character, or rather manners.

It is desirable, though somewhat difficult, to make conscientious people interesting in a book ; but we do not agree with Walter when he tells Anna that she wants feeling. It is a mistake to call those persons cold, who adhere inflexibly to duty. Moral motives are as much matters of the heart as are earthly affections, and self-sacrifice and devotion like Anna's, show a strong nature, — a capacity for deep feeling. She proved by her disregard of all other claims to her affections, and by her angelic ministry at Walter's dying bed, how fervent and true was her attachment. We might notice a few minor faults ; but, as faults are things easily found out, we may safely omit them here, without the danger of their being overlooked by the reader.

In placing the works of the writers of this series in the hands of the young, we must not rely too much on them. They illustrate principles in an easy, happy manner, and bring them home to minds that would never find them, unless so assisted ; still more, they suggest desires for moral excellence, and give birth to resolutions and endeavours. This impulse, this first step, of such value in all progress, is to be highly prized ; — but it should also be kept in view, that it is a law of our nature, that an art can only be acquired by practice, by doing frequently, what we wish to do thoroughly and without fail. Now living is an *art*, a difficult, elaborate, and most momentous art. On the correctness of our knowledge, on the completeness of our performance of this art, depend our dearest hopes for the present and the future. We may look on and see this work performed day after day, with an understanding of its principles and an admiration of its beautiful results ; but we shall not possess the power to do it ourselves, unless we put our own hand to the work. As well might the most enthusiastic pupil of Canova, seating himself in his master's *studio*, have followed with his eye, and even with his whole heart, the movements of his master's fingers, noted down the thousand touches, which bring out, by degrees almost imperceptible to the beholder, the exquisite forms which bear the impress of his genius, — in the expectation of rising up a sculptor. In the great business of living wisely and virtuously in this world, those principles of our nature which prompt to action must be called into operation. The individual must not merely be placed in circumstances in which holy motives and pure desires are excited, but he must be allowed the means and opportunities of practice, by which alone he can learn how to obey and

act out these impulses with freedom, and, as it were, spontaneously.

Bishop Butler in his admirable essay on Virtue, has done perfect justice to this subject ; and we would attempt nothing more than to direct attention anew to the important principle, that virtue is *doing*, not thinking only, — that it cannot be imposed, but must be *ingrained*. Good advice and, still more, good example are important aids ; but they go no farther than to dispose the heart to excellence, and to throw light on the path, in which it is to be found. The individual must obtain it for himself.

Although there is no object connected with the good of society, for which greater efforts have been made in the present age, than for education, there is still a discouraging uncertainty attending it ; and this every reflecting parent feels to be the case. Its objects are pretty well ascertained, at least better than they were formerly ; but there is no unfailing method yet discovered, of securing them. In other words, we have no science of education, but only a vast amount of undigested data.

Science supposes such an acquaintance with the laws of nature, as will enable us to apply these laws so as to effect our own purposes. It is by a knowledge of the laws of gravity, motion, the expansive power of steam, &c., that we construct steam-boats, rail-roads, and cotton-mills. Any person who should undertake to perform such wonders of art without a knowledge of these laws, would fail ; in fact, we succeed just so far as we clearly comprehend, and accurately obey them, and no farther. A mistake of a single degree in the angle of elevation at which a car may be propelled by the power of steam, would have disappointed the Worcester Rail-road Company of their profits, and the public of the great accommodation of being able to travel from Boston to Worcester and back again, twice in one day. Now the laws of our intellectual and moral nature, though they may be less easily discovered and understood than those of matter, are quite as regular, as efficient, and as inevitable in their operation. To produce any given effect on character and conduct, we must resort to them. Our power extends no farther than to ascertain these laws, and bring them to bear on the subject we design to affect. It is all lost labor to oppose them, or to try to hinder their operation. Such an attempt the merest enthusiast

would not make in his dealings with matter. Yet it is continually made in our dealings with mind ; and the reason is obvious. Although, as has been said, we have many data, we have no system of moral and intellectual philosophy, which will answer the purposes of science ; that is, no system, whose principles are so well established, that each one can go to it for the rule he needs, and be sure of success in its application. Whether such a science is within the limit of human powers we will not presume to decide ; but, until we do obtain it, those arts which depend on the principles of man's internal constitution, the arts of government, of education, of living, of reforming the vicious, will never advance much beyond their present unsettled state, and our discoveries and acquisitions will continue to be incidental and miscellaneous, and therefore of little avail as regards the end proposed above.

There is no field in which philosophy has labored more industriously, although with such poor success, than that of the human mind. The peculiar difficulties of the subject have often been stated, and it is not necessary to repeat them here. While they help to account for past failures, they are not such as to discourage future attempts. The miscellaneous character of the efforts, which have been and are made, is probably after all one of the greatest obstacles to progress. Science is built up by the labor of successive minds, each taking up the work where its predecessor left it ; no one science has been completed by a single mind. This is no new idea. Every one admits its truth ; yet its force is not felt in intellectual as in physical science, as is proved by its not being acted on. No philosopher of the present day would expect to effect any thing valuable in physical science, unless he took up the subject he designed to prosecute at the precise point where those who had labored before him had arrived, availed himself of their discoveries, conformed to known laws, or obtained others hitherto unknown by a fresh induction. That this has not been done in intellectual science (the most difficult and abstruse of all), no one will deny. In this department, we have almost as many different systems as writers ; and the present mode of studying metaphysics is, not to ascertain what are the facts which are known and recorded concerning man's spiritual nature, and what are the general principles established by these facts, — but what is the theory, or the opinions, of this or that philosopher.

When we reflect on the rapid progress, the achievements once not dreamed of, made in the arts of life, since men have adopted true principles, and have ceased to work in the dark, on these subjects, and when we remember, that, however varied the condition in which man is placed, he must still act in conformity to the elements and principles of his constitution, we are not yet ready to sit down with the disheartening conviction, that he will never succeed in the attempt to arrange the present multifarious mass of mental phenomena, and evolve the first principles to which they must all be referable. We believe this will be accomplished, as soon as we are content to pursue the subject by the same course of patient induction, which is recognised as the only condition of science in the material world, and without which, as has been said by Lord Brougham, a man "may be a Fancier, but cannot be a Philosopher." A conviction that this is the only true and universal method, is gaining ground. The success with which it has been applied in Paris, especially by M. Louis, to the investigation of the causes and conditions of diseases, and the light it has already thrown on the unsettled principles of the medical art, prove to what an extent order and certainty may be introduced by it into phenomena the most complicated and recondite.

On this subject, however, there is reason to believe, that we have not the excuse of ignorance to so great an extent as many suppose. There are some laws of mind generally recognised and acted on; and, as far as this is the case, success always follows. There are others known, at least not generally denied, which are yet often neglected; and we daily witness attempts to produce effects on character and conduct wholly at variance with them, and people wonder at the failure, but are not instructed by it.

It is admitted, for instance, that what have been called the *emotive* powers, the desires, affections, &c., are the springs of action, the principles which impel and produce human conduct. And yet we often observe those, who are engaged in the formation of character by means of education or public legislation, disregard this known law of mind, and undertake to produce, by cold precept and formal ordinances, the energetic action and undivided attention which are the results of voluntary effort. How little is that single principle, the *will*, understood and appreciated. All admit, when questioned,

that it is an essential element in human conduct, — that you may as well undertake to balance a mill-stone by a feather, as to move the free agent one step without it ; and yet we go on, doing and expecting, as if this were only an incidental circumstance, and not a fixed law.

It is also known that sympathy and emulation are suns to the mind, that they double its capacities, quicken its powers, and bring out fresh shoots ; — yet these principles are not unfrequently disregarded by those, whose business it is to develop or employ the moral and intellectual powers of their fellow creatures. It has been found that fear is a *debasing* principle, that it chills and checks the operations of the mind, and shuts up the soul. Its use is obvious ; it was given to deter us from doing what is wrong or hurtful. But this principle is sometimes applied, not to deter from, but to prompt to action, with the vain expectation of obtaining that free and fair use of the powers which only produces satisfactory results, from the application of a law whose tendency is to prevent such use. Even the trite maxim, that example is better than precept, is sinned against every day. This often comes, we are aware, from weakness and indolence. Precept is so much easier than example, that we are ready to content our consciences with the lesser sacrifice, hoping to make up in quantity, what is wanting in quality. But if we had a thorough conviction of the authority of the laws of the human mind, however weak and inefficient might be our conduct, we should not be guilty of the mistake of attempting ends unless we could bring into use the appropriate means ; at least we should not attempt them by means understood to be essentially inappropriate. If our fire was going out, and a vessel of water stood by our side, while the fuel was at some distance from us, although our indolence or incapacity might prevent us from going for the fuel, we should hardly think it advisable to throw on the water, in the hope that it would revive and feed the flame. Yet conduct not less irrational may be observed every day in our intercourse with mankind.

Many more instances might be mentioned, of that disregard of known laws, in our attempts to act on mind, which would be deemed absurd in our dealings with matter. It is not our design to make a complete list of such instances, but to enforce the principle, that, since nature in all her phenomena of mind, not less than in those of matter, is subject to

regular laws, it is only in proportion as the teacher, the philanthropist, and the political reformer become acquainted with, and conform to these laws, that they can reasonably expect to accomplish their objects ; and to this extent they may expect to accomplish them. Thus, if in education we observed the law, that the mind acts vigorously and does full justice to its powers only when its sympathies are alive and its desires ardent ; that we do not work hard to obtain what we do not relish, comprehend, or love ; that the services rendered by fear are feeble and false, those by love true and abundant ; — if, in our attempt to better the condition of the poor, we kept in sight the principle that habits of industry and a regard to character are among the best securities against mendicity ; — if, in our plans for moral reform, we remembered that sympathy, occupation, and the acquisition of knowledge generate purifying processes in the character, and that religion is the soul's central light and power, the basis and bond of perfectness, — even if we made no new accessions to our knowledge of the philosophy of mind, our labors would be far more frequently, than they now are, rewarded by success. But we are looking for new accessions. The impulse everywhere given to free enquiry, seems to act like the magician's wand on the face of society. "The Press," which, to borrow the words of a late writer, "has rendered the world one great whispering gallery, whose faintest echoes are distinctly heard at the farthest end," is pouring out its productions in endless variety and abundance. That grand principle, the diffusion of knowledge, is the product of our own times ; there was nothing like it in antiquity. In its operation, an experiment on human nature is instituted, next to Christianity, the most momentous ever made upon the race. As knowledge is power, it is placing in the hands of the community, and of each individual that composes it, an engine mighty beyond all conception ; and, if knowledge be virtue, as it ought to be, and as we trust it is to be, this accession of power is destined to swell the fountains of human felicity and improvement, to an extent, which we, who are on the outskirts of this vast movement, can but dimly discern.

ART. V. — *Meaning of the Title, "Angel of Jehovah," as used in Scripture; being in continuation of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament."**

WE resume the discussion of the question, Whether the Deity of the Messiah be a doctrine of the Old Testament. In our last article upon the subject, we examined all the passages adduced by Hengstenberg, in which the Messiah is mentioned as such, or as the future anointed one, whom God was to raise up for the deliverance of his people. The passages which remain to be examined are of a different kind. They are those, in which an angel of Jehovah is represented as having appeared to various persons, which angel is said by Hengstenberg and others to be identical both with Jehovah and with the Messiah. The discussion of the argument founded on the passages in question we regard as rendered necessary solely by the ingenuity and respectability of the learned men of the present time, who have adopted it; such as John Pye Smith, whose work on "The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah" is said to have placed him at the head of the English Dissenting theologians, and such as Hengstenberg, and the Andover theologians, who published his argument in their "Repository" without comment. We are confident that no common readers of the Bible would imagine, that the angel, who was manifested to the patriarchs and others, was Jesus Christ. We suppose that few in fact believe it. We suppose that the common faith amongst those who have not been led astray by learned ingenuity aiming to establish a theory, is, that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, *hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son,*" and not until those last days. Still, as long as such an argument is insisted on by high living authority, the "Christian Examiner" must not regard it as unworthy of an investigation.

In the passages which we propose to examine, it is not pretended that the Messiah as such is denoted, or declared to be identical with Jehovah. It is not pretended by any writer, that the doctrine of the Deity of the Messiah is extracted

* See Christian Examiner for January, 1836. Vol. XIX. p. 302.

from them, except by taking them in connexion with other parts of Scripture. From the passages themselves it is inferred by Hengstenberg, that the angel mentioned in them is identical with Jehovah; and from other passages, and other considerations, it is inferred that the same angel is identical with the Messiah or with Jesus Christ. His argument is founded on an axiom not to be met with in any edition of Euclid that we have seen, namely, Two persons, being identical with a third person, are identical with each other. Or, to put it in language less abstract; If James and John are proved to be the same being with Peter, then James is John and John is James. By virtue of this axiom, if Jehovah himself and the Messiah are both proved to be identical with the angel of Jehovah, it follows that they must be identical with each other, and that the Messiah is Almighty God.

We shall not stop to remark upon the confusion of ideas or the manifest contradictions, presented in the very statement of the doctrine which Hengstenberg undertakes to prove. We will forget, as far as practicable, the nature of the doctrine, and consider the question entirely as one of Biblical interpretation. Our inquiry shall be, What is the true exposition of the passages of Scripture above referred to, from which the Deity of the Messiah has been inferred?

The argument, as we have intimated, consists of two points, or involves two propositions; first, that the angel of Jehovah is a distinct person from Jehovah, and yet truly and essentially the same being with him; and, second, that this angel is the same being with the Messiah. Each proposition is to be proved by separate evidence. In the first place, therefore, we will consider the evidence brought to support the first. As the passages, which are supposed to contain the evidence of this proposition, resemble each other, and are all to be explained in the same way, it may be as well to place before the reader several of those, which are regarded as the most important, so that, having the facts or phenomena of the case before us, we may be able to judge, which is the true or best explanation of the difficulties which they present.

Genesis xvi. 7. — “And an angel of Jehovah found her [Hagar] by a fountain of water in the wilderness. V. 10. And the angel of Jehovah said to her, I will multiply thine offspring exceedingly, &c. V. 13. And she called the name of *Jehovah*, who spake with her, Thou art *a God* that mayest be seen. For, said

she, do I not here see the light, though I have seen God? * Wherefore the well was called the well of life, of vision."

Genesis xviii. 1. "And Jehovah appeared to him [Abraham] amid the oaks of Mamre, while he was sitting at the door of his tent in the heat of the day. And he lifted up his eyes, and looked, and lo, three men stood before him; and when he saw them, he ran from the door of his tent to meet them, and bowed himself to the ground, and said, My Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant. V. 13. And Jehovah said to Abraham, Wherefore, &c. Is any thing too hard for Jehovah? About this time another year *will I return to thee*, and Sarah shall have a son. V. 16. And the men rose up from thence, and looked toward Sodom, and Abraham set out with them to accompany them on their way. V. 20. *And Jehovah said*, The cry concerning Sodom is great, and their sin is very gross; I will therefore go down, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry concerning it; or if not, I will know. And the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom, but Abraham remained standing before Jehovah. And Abraham drew near and said, Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? xix. 1. And the two angels came to Sodom at even. Vv. 12, 13. And the men said, — For we will destroy this place, because the cry concerning them has become great before Jehovah, and Jehovah hath sent us to destroy it. V. 16. And while he lingered, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters, Jehovah having compassion upon him; and they brought him forth, and set him without the city.

V. 18. "And Lot said to them, O not so, Lord! Behold now thy servant hath found favor in thy sight, and great is the mercy thou hast shown me in saving my life. — And he said, See I have regard to thee in this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city, for which thou hast spoken. V. 24. Then Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from Jehovah out of heaven." See also Gen. xxi. 17, 18; xxii. 1, 11 – 14.

Exodus iii. 2. "And an angel of Jehovah appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned. And when Jehovah saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called to him out of the bush and said, &c. V. 6. Moreover he said, *I am the God of thy father*, the God of

* I have paraphrased this verse a little, to bring out what I suppose to be the meaning. The literal rendering would be, "Thou art a God of vision. For, said she, do I not here see (i. e. live) after vision?"

Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God. And Jehovah said, I have surely seen," &c.

Judges vi. 12. "And the angel of Jehovah appeared to him, and said to him, Jehovah is with thee, &c. V. 14. And Jehovah looked upon him and said, &c. V. 22. And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of Jehovah, Gideon said, Alas! O Lord Jehovah! because I have seen an angel of Jehovah face to face."

Judges xiii. 3, 21, 22, 23. "But the angel of Jehovah did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of Jehovah. And Manoah said to his wife, We shall surely die; *for we have seen God*. But his wife said, If Jehovah had a desire to kill us, he would not have received a burnt offering," &c.

From these passages it appears, that persons, having seen an angel of Jehovah, are said to have seen God; that an angel is said to have appeared in a flame of fire in a bush, and immediately after, God is said to have called to Moses out of the bush, and to have said, "I am the God of Abraham," &c.; that in one verse, an angel of Jehovah is said to have spoken to Gideon, and in the following, "and Jehovah looked upon him and said," &c.

To account for this singular phraseology there have been three principal theories.

1. That which supposes the "angel" to denote the second person in the Trinity, i. e. a distinct person from God, and yet essentially, not nominally and virtually, the same being with God.

2. That which supposes "angel" to denote a symbol of the divine presence, or Jehovah himself manifested to the human senses by a material symbol or token, a fire, a voice, or the form of a man; that the angel was not in itself a person, and that no *personal* agent was concerned, but the Supreme Being himself.

3. That by the "angel of Jehovah" is meant one of those heavenly spirits, which are represented as standing in the presence of God to do his bidding, and bear his messages, and which, existing only to execute the will of God, intrusted with his purposes, speaking his words, and especially having his name, his divine authority, his *numen* in him, is allowed to personate the Deity.

Of these three theories, it is to be observed, that the first

implies a very important doctrine, as well as a very singular and apparently contradictory one, in regard to the divine existence. The two last imply no new doctrine relating to the divine existence, and the only question is, which explanation is best authorized by the established laws of interpretation. Not so with the first, and we object against it,

I. That it is a mere theory. The doctrine of a person, called "an angel" or "the angel of Jehovah," a person distinct from God and yet the same being with him, is nowhere taught in the Old Testament; nowhere laid down as a truth to be believed. It is not pretended, that the passages in question declare the doctrine. They relate entirely to a very different subject, and have a very different object from that of teaching the mode of the divine existence. If the passages in question imply such a doctrine, they certainly do not state it. We object, therefore, to the theory of Hengstenberg, that, if so important and so perplexing a doctrine had been true, it would somewhere in the revelation of Moses have been expressly stated; its relation to the divine unity would have been defined. The Jewish lawgiver has been very explicit in laying down the doctrine of the unity of God: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God, Jehovah is one." His hearers must have understood the word *one* in the common acceptation of the word, as signifying one person, one intelligent agent, one infinite mind, one person. But, if Moses had believed such a doctrine as that which Hengstenberg supposes to be implied in the passages in question, that the Deity exists in two or more persons, one of whom is "the hidden God," and the other sent to the sons of men, we should somewhere find an express statement of the doctrine. We should find cautions given, that the doctrine might not be confounded with polytheism, or that it might not degenerate into polytheism. If the passages imply merely a singular usage of language, that usage must have been understood at the time when they were written, and then needed no explanation, however extraordinary it may appear now. But, if they imply the doctrine of two persons, each of which is God, it is impossible to account for the fact, that so extraordinary a doctrine is not laid down, stated in express terms, and its relation to the divine unity explained; especially as polytheism was the vice to which the Jews were most prone, and as the doctrine of the unity of God is the corner-stone of the Jewish dispensation. But this is not done, either in the

Pentateuch, or in the writings of any of the Jewish historians, or in any of the poets or prophets. The difficult passages themselves, or others still less satisfactory, are the only ones in the Old Testament, which are supposed even to imply it.

II. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg, that the title "son of God" expresses the highest nature of Jesus, or denotes the second person in the Trinity. But, if the second person in the Trinity be referred to in these passages, why is he not called the "son of God" in some of them at least? Why does nothing occur in these passages, or in any part of the Old Testament, to lead one to suppose that "angel of Jehovah" and "son of God" are synonymous?

III. A decisive objection against the theory of Hengstenberg is, that there is nothing in the passages in question to warrant the supposition, that one and the same angel is always intended. The word in the Hebrew is used without the article, so that our translators correctly render it, "*an* angel of Jehovah." Nothing occurs to show that any particular angel, any preëminent angel, was intended. It is as if it had been said, that one of the thousands of the angels of Jehovah, or one of the angels of his presence, one of several which use to stand before God, had appeared. The angel, too, is sent by God, and does not come without orders, or of his own accord. In the vision of Jacob's ladder, Gen. xxviii. 12, the angels of God are represented as ascending and descending, Jehovah being at the top to give commands and to receive communications. This vision no doubt implies the belief of the writer in many angels. So, chap. xxxii. 1, angels of God are said to have met Jacob. When then we read of *an* angel of Jehovah without a name or mark of preëminence we must infer that one of the many angels spoken of by the same writer is intended.

And that no particular, preëminent angel, a person distinct from God and yet the same being with him, was intended, we think is evident from the representation in chapters xviii., xix., which shows, as we think, that to each of three angels are the names and attributes applied, which are supposed to prove one to be the second person in the Trinity. In xviii. 1, it is said, "Jehovah appeared to Abraham; — behold, three men stood by him;" i. e. three angels, as we think, and as the caption of the chapter stands in the Common Version. Jehovah appeared, or was manifested, to him equally by each of the

three angels. This is the view of the case taken by the authors of the Common Version, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* and by most interpreters.† The supposition, that one of these men in appearance was Jehovah himself, in person, accompanied by two angels, and that he ate with Abraham, does not so well accord with Jewish opinions, or with verses 1 and 2, or with verses 20, 21; "*I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come to me; and if not, I will know. And the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom.*" By the men are evidently meant the two angels, said in xix. 1, to have arrived at Sodom, and Jehovah goes down by these two angels. As to the fact that Abraham, in xviii. 3, uses the singular number, "*My Lord*, if I have found favor in thy sight," which is used as an argument to show that one of them was preëminent, and probably Jehovah himself, accompanied by two angels, it proves no such thing; for, in xix. 18, 19, precisely the same phraseology occurs in relation to the two angels. "And Lot said to *them*, O not so, my Lord."

In verse 21, one of the angels says, "See *I* have accepted thee concerning this thing also, that *I* will not overthrow this

* Hebrews xiii. 2.

† Thus D'Oyly says, in his Answer to Sir William Drummond's attack upon Revelation, (p. 40,) "You insinuate, that Christians believe the Supreme Jehovah to have actually come to Abraham in a human form, to have sate at table familiarly with him, and to have partaken of the calf which he dressed."

"Really, Sir, it is astonishing you should have hazarded such an assertion, when, at the head of the chapter, in our authorized English translation, you might have read, 'Abraham entertaineth *three angels*;' a complete proof, that, by the English readers at least, the passage is understood to speak, not of Jehovah himself appearing, but of angels or messengers commissioned by him; and almost every commentator, whom you could have consulted, would have taught you to understand it precisely in the same manner. I admit the expression runs in some parts of the narrative, as if the Lord were present in person, and spoke with Abraham.

"But you cannot be ignorant, how common a form of language it is, to say, that a person does himself what he commissions another to do. . . . If you turn to Exod. iii. 2, you will find it expressed, the 'angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a bush;' but the account goes on (ver. 4), '*The Lord* saw that he turned aside; *the Lord* said, I am the God of thy fathers,' &c. Here most clearly, the Lord is said to have spoken himself, when an angel appeared and spoke in his name. . . . This passage has been always held, with very few exceptions, to treat of three angels."

city, for which thou hast spoken." Here one of the angels evidently assumes the attributes of Jehovah as much as the one, who remained with Abraham in chapter xviii.

As to verse 24, "Then Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven," whether by "Jehovah" first mentioned in the verse is intended the angel representing or personating the Deity, who had just consented to spare Zoar, is uncertain. This was the opinion of Grotius, who understands by the phrase "from Jehovah" in the latter part of the verse, "by the aid of Jehovah," "*potestate sibi divinitus concessâ*." And it is a little remarkable that the same explanation is adopted in the book *Sohar*, upon which Hengstenberg relies so much, as we shall see hereafter, to prove the Deity of the angel. Commenting on "Jehovah" first mentioned in the verse, the writer says, "*Hic est gradus, sive persona ex judicio inferiore, quæ accepit potestatem de superioribus*."*

Another opinion is that of the Arabic translator, followed by the best of Jewish critics, Aben Ezra, and by Calvin and others, who suppose the language to mean, "Jehovah rained from himself, &c.," which is thus ably defended by Dr. Geddes. "Nothing is more common in the Oriental languages, than to use the noun for the pronoun; and this indeed seems to be the language of nature. A child is not wont to say of himself, 'I am a good boy;' but 'Billy good boy;' or of his sister, 'Thou art a naughty girl,' but 'Sally naughty girl;' and it is with some difficulty that he is made to understand, that *I* means himself, and *thou* the person to whom he speaks. A few examples from Scripture will, I apprehend, settle this matter. Gen. ii. 3, 'God blessed the seventh day, &c., because on it he ceased from all his works, which *he* (the text has *God*) had ordained to create.' Exod. xvi. 7. 'Ye shall see the glory of the Lord, on his hearing your murmurings against *him*;' — the text has against *the Lord*. Thus Josh. ix. 21. 'Let them live,' said the chiefs, 'as the *chiefs* (i. e. *we*) have promised to them,' &c. 1 Kings ii. 19, 'Solomon caused a throne to be placed for the *king's* mother,' i. e. for *his own* mother."

It seems, then, to be indifferent to the writer, whether he says, that either of the three angels, two of whom say, "Jehovah sent

* See Schoettgen, *Hor. Heb. et Talmud.*, Vol. II. p. 430.

us to destroy the city," speaks, or that Jehovah speaks. "Jehovah," and "the angel" or "angels of Jehovah," are used as interchangeable terms. What either of these angels says, Jehovah says. What either of them does, Jehovah does. Jehovah was manifested and spake by all three of them, as he might in three or more prophets. It is evident, then, that the same kind of language, which has been supposed to prove an angel to be the same being with Jehovah, is here applied to three. It follows, then, that no particular angel is denoted in the passages in question. The same names and attributes may in the same way be applied to every angel or all the angels, whom Jehovah might send.

That no particular angel was intended is also manifest from Numbers xx. 16. "And when we cried unto Jehovah, he heard our voice and sent *an* angel," not any particular, preëminent angel, but simply an angel.

Hengstenberg, it is true, maintains that the language in question must always denote one particular angel. "Certainly," says he, "מֵלָאךְ אֱלֹהִים cannot be translated 'an angel of God.'" "מֵלָאךְ יְהוָה cannot possibly be translated otherwise than by '*the* angel of Jehovah.'" Such is the confidence of the man, though his assertion is in opposition, probably, to every translation of the Scriptures, that ever was made; certainly to every one, with which we are acquainted. He appeals, for his authority, to the Grammar of Ewald, §§ 305, 308, a work which we have not been able to examine. We shall be unwilling to believe that it contains any rule to support his assertion, until we do see it. The notion is probably the exclusive property of Hengstenberg. It amounts to this, that the Hebrew language cannot express the meaning conveyed by the terms, "*an* angel of Jehovah," without using the circumlocution, "one of the angels of Jehovah." Of course, to express the meaning "a prophet of God," it must use the circumlocution "one of the prophets of God."

The question may easily be settled by applying the rule to a few passages of scripture.

Let us apply it to Judges xiii. 6. The wife of Manoah says to him, "A man of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God." According to Hengstenberg it should be, "*The* man of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of

the angel of God." A rendering, which, in the connexion in which it stands, is little short of nonsense; unless it were the belief of the speaker that Jehovah had but one angel. But this will not be maintained. 1 Kings xxii. 7. "And Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of Jehovah?" According to Hengstenberg's rule, "Is not *the* prophet of Jehovah here?" a rendering entirely inconsistent with the connexion.*

If Hengstenberg had been as anxious to ascertain the validity of his rule, as to establish the point he had in view, he would not have wondered so much, "that this rule should have been overlooked by so great a number of learned men among the moderns."

Another argument, by which Hengstenberg endeavours to prove, that not a common angel is meant, but one superior to all created angels, is drawn from the narrative in Genesis xviii., where he maintains that two of the angels fall into the background in comparison with the third. This argument we have already refuted. We add to our remarks upon that chapter, that the circumstance of Abraham's using the singular, "My Lord," in addressing the angels, appears to us to be most probably a mere idiom of the Hebrew language; the meaning being, that he applied the appellation "my Lord" to *every one* of them.† The same idiom occurs in the address of Lot to the two angels, xix. 18. This last verse shows at least, that whatever superiority one angel might appear to have over the two others, was possessed by the second over the third.‡

* See also 2 Kings iii. 11. 2 Chron. xviii. 6, xxviii. 9. In some instances the common version gives a wrong sense by using the definite instead of the indefinite article. Thus Gen. xiv. 18, "*the* priest of the most high God," as if there were but one in the world. Gen. xxxii. 1, "*the* angels of God," which leads to the vain inquiry, what angels?

† This explanation is mentioned by Junius. "Omnes simul appellat primum, tanquam e longinquo; tandem singulos prensat et invitat; nisi fortè speciatim eum compellaverit, quem herum fuisse ex specie judicabat." See Poole's Synopsis, upon Gen. xviii. 3.

‡ The note of St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xvi. Cap. 29, as quoted in Le Clerc's Commentary on Gen. xviii. 1, is well worth transferring to our pages. It agrees in substance, though not in all particulars, with our explanation. "Deus apparuit Abrahæ ad quercum Mambræ, in tribus viris, quos dubitandum non est angelos fuisse, quamvis quidam existiment unum in eis fuisse Dominum Christum," &c. Verum tamen si propterea confirmant horum trium aliquem fuisse

Hengstenberg says also, "Jehovah, or, as he is called in Ch. xxxi. 11, 'the angel of God,' stands on the top of the ladder, while the angels ascend and descend on the same." This is a misstatement. In chapter xxxi. 11, an angel is spoken of, who appeared in a dream to Jacob whilst he was serving Laban. That he calls himself the God of Bethel, is to be explained in the same manner as the other passages, in which "the angel" is used interchangeably with "God."

Another argument is derived from Isaiah lxiii. 9, where it is said, in the Common Version, "The angel of his presence (or face, or countenance,) saved them." But the term פָּנָיו, "his face," "his presence," is often used as a mere periphrasis of the third personal pronoun; and the verse in question will mean merely, that "*his* angel," or "an angel of God," saved them.*

One other argument Hengstenberg draws from Exodus xxxiii. 2, 3, where God threatens to leave the Israelites to the conduct of an angel, and not to go with them himself. But I find here no reference to an *inferior* angel in distinction from a superior one. A few verses preceding, xxxii. 34, Jeho-

Christum, quia cum tres vidisset, ad Dominum singulariter est locutus, &c.; cur non etiam illud advertunt, duos ex eis venisse, ut Sodomitæ delerentur, cum adhuc Abraham ad unum loqueretur, Dominum appellans, et intercedens ne simul justum cum impio in Sodomis perderet? illos autem duos sic suscepit Lot, ut etiam ipse, in colloquio suo cum illis, singulariter Dominum appellaret, &c.: 'Oro, *Domine*, quia invenit puer tuus misericordiam ante te,' et quæ sequuntur. Deinde post hæc verba, singulariter illi respondet Dominus, cum in *duobus* angelis esset, dicens: 'Ecce, miseratus sum faciem tuam,' &c., unde multo est credibilius, quod et Abraham in tribus et Lot in duobus viris Dominum agnoscebant, cui per singularem numerum loquebantur, etiam cum eos homines esse arbitrarentur. Neque enim aliam ob causam sic eos susceperunt, ut tanquam mortalibus et humanâ refectione indigentibus ministrarent; sed erat profecto aliquid, quo ita excellebant, licet tanquam homines, ut *in eis* esse Dominum, sicut assolet esse in prophetis, hi, qui hospitalitatem illis exhibebant, dubitare non possent. Atque ideo et ipsos aliquando pluraliter, ut Dominos; aliquando singulariter, ut *in eis Dominum*, appellabant."

* See Prov. vii. 15, and Ezek. vi. 9., where "loathe themselves" is in the original "loathe their faces." Also Stuart's Grammar, § 475. So Gesenius and De Wette understand the verse. Others, as Lowth and Eichhorn, understand the phrase to mean "an angel that stands in the presence of God"; i. e. one of the few, who were admitted into his more immediate presence, in allusion to the sentiments and customs of the kings of the East, who admitted only the most distinguished into their presence. Calvin's opinion we shall have occasion to give in another place.

vah says, "*My* angel shall go before thee," which would certainly seem to denote as high an angel as is denoted in Exodus xxiii. 20, "Behold I send *an* angel before thee," &c. It appears to me that what Jehovah threatens is, that he would withdraw his immediate presence from them, whether that presence was regarded as residing in the cloudy pillar which accompanied the angel, (compare vv. 7, 8, 9, 10,) or in the angel himself. What is added in Exodus xxiii. 21, "For my name is in him," appears to me to favor a conclusion the very reverse of that which Hengstenberg derives from it. It seems to me to show, that it was a common angel, who was to be sent by Jehovah, yet one that was to be obeyed, not simply as an angel, but because "the name of God was in him." I think it probable that "my name" means, my *numen*, my divine spirit, my presence, accompanying the angel, or dwelling in him, as it might dwell in a thousand angels at the same time, or in human beings. So in latter times the Shechinah, though regarded as perfectly distinct from the angel, was said to be with him, or in him, as also in human beings, as will be seen hereafter. This *numen*, or *presence*, may be what was threatened to be withdrawn, in ch. xxxiii. Certainly, if the meaning had been, that God would withdraw an exalted angel, who had hitherto guided the Israelites, and send an inferior one, very different language would have been used. The language is, that he himself, in contradistinction from any angel, would not go with them. He would send before them such an angel as he had formerly sent, but unaccompanied with his immediate presence, whether this presence was regarded as dwelling in the angel, or in the cloudy pillar.

If then the representation in the passages under consideration is, that merely *an* angel, one of the many angels of Jehovah, appeared, and if to any one of the thousands of angels, whom Jehovah might send, the names, attributes, and actions might by Scripture usage be applied, which are applied to the angel in those passages, then the theory of Hengstenberg is unsound.

IV. The passages in question may be satisfactorily explained as implying only a singular use of language, without supposing that the sacred historians meant to teach, by a few casual hints or intimations, a new and strange doctrine, apparently inconsistent with the fundamental doctrine of Judaism. It is true, that these passages present difficulties. For it is not

very easy to determine with exactness what were the Jewish conceptions respecting angels in every period of their history. Hence, as we have mentioned, there are two modes of explaining the fact, that the terms, "the angel of God," and "God" or "Jehovah" are used interchangeably.

One of the modes of explaining the passages, that which is most common amongst the English Unitarians, and which has the support of high authority amongst the Germans, as also of Professor Stuart of Andover,* is, that the angel is of itself nothing personal, but only a sensible manifestation of the divine presence, in the human form or otherwise, employed as the instrument of accomplishing his purposes; in other words, that the angel was Jehovah himself manifesting himself in a flame, &c., or in the body of a man, having no existence after the purposes of the mission were accomplished. This theory commends itself by its simplicity, and will perhaps explain some of the passages in question; but we doubt whether it will explain all of them, or whether it will account for all the facts of the case. The origin of the Jewish conceptions respecting angels and the process of their formation are one thing; and the actual conceptions of the Jews, in the time of the authors of the Pentateuch and the Book of Judges, are another. And, whatever may be thought of the opinion of De Wette, that angels were originally personifications of extraordinary operations of nature, or of remarkable providences, we doubt very much whether the representation in the passages under consideration is, that the angel was nothing personal of itself.

In order to arrive at a just conclusion, it may be well to investigate the meaning of the word translated *angel*. It is a word of not infrequent occurrence, and its signification may be ascertained by Scripture usage.

מַלְאָךְ is derived from a verb not in use in the Hebrew language, but found in the Arabic and Æthiopic, and denoting *to send as a messenger*, — *legavit, misit nuntium*. See Gesen. ad לָאָךְ. It is used everywhere, at least a hundred times,† in the Old Testament, to denote a messenger from a private person or a king. Wherever in the common version the words

* See De Wette's *Dogmatik*, p. 81; and Stuart's *Hebrew Chrestomathy*, p. 167, n. 2, where he explains מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה in Exod. iii. 2, "Jehovah as manifesting himself to Moses, Jehovah as exhibited by symbol."

† See Taylor's Concordance.

"messenger," "messengers," "ambassadors" occur, they are the translation of מַלְאָךְ in the singular or plural. It is sometimes applied to a prophet, as in Haggai i. 13, and sometimes to a priest, as in Malachi ii. 7, and once, in Isaiah xlii. 19, to the nation of Israel, as the ambassador of God and teacher of the nations. When not used to denote angels, it always denotes a personal agent, a messenger. Nor, if we put the passages under consideration out of view, is there more reason for supposing that it can be applied to an inanimate substance, than the Greek ἄγγελος, or the Latin *nuncius*, or the English *messenger*, *legate*, or *ambassador*.

We think it probable, therefore, that, when the word is used to denote the instruments employed to make known the will of God from heaven, it always denotes personal agents; personal, intelligent messengers. We think that those writers have failed, who have undertaken to prove that the word in question does not include the idea of an intelligent spirit, but that it denotes whatever thing may bear a message, and that it is as applicable to a letter, to a message, to a disease, to any agency or manifestation of God, or to any of the powers of nature, as to a personal messenger. We think the writers in question have confounded plain and figurative language. Thus the fourth verse of Psalm civ. "He maketh the winds his messengers, the flaming lightnings his ministers," is set forth by some writers as an express declaration of the meaning of the word, as denoting an inanimate as well as an intelligent agent. The truth is, this verse proves the very reverse of what it is alleged to prove. It loses half its beauty, unless you understand the word in question to denote a personal, intelligent messenger. For the meaning is, not merely that God makes use of the winds or lightnings to accomplish his purposes, but that these elements, so uncontrollable by man, execute his commands as if they were endowed with intelligence, like personal messengers and servants. That the Hebrew term, as well as the English *messenger*, may be applied in a figurative sense to an inanimate object, is plain. Affliction is sometimes said to be a messenger of mercy. But even in this case the word "messenger" does not lose its primary signification.

In 1 Chron. xxi. 14, it is said, "So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel," and in the following verse, "And God sent an angel to Jerusalem to destroy it." And from this it has been concluded, that "pestilence" and "angel" mean precisely

the same thing. But how do they, who adopt this opinion, account for the fact that David "saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and heaven having a drawn sword in his hand," — and that "he stood by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite," — and that "Jehovah said to the angel, that destroyed, Stay now thine hand"? The conception of the historian evidently was, that Jehovah sent a personal angel, and that the angel caused the disease.

As far then as Hebrew usage is concerned we have no reason to suppose that the Hebrew מַלְאָךְ has any greater latitude of signification, than the English *messenger*.

It does not follow, however, but that it may, in a figurative sense, be applied to other than personal agents. Whether it is so, must be decided by the connexion in which the word is used, and other considerations. All that we maintain is, that there is nothing in the meaning of מַלְאָךְ which makes it more applicable to an inanimate object, than the English word *messenger*.

The common meaning of the term, as established by Scripture usage, as denoting a personal messenger, is not, then, very favorable to the theory we are now examining.

2. The conceptions of the Jews concerning angels, as manifested in the Pentateuch, are intimated in the dream of Jacob's ladder. Gen. xxviii. 12. It was a vision, but a vision implying a belief of personal agents, called "angels," in the narrator. Again, we read that angels of God met Jacob. Gen. xxxii. 1. When, therefore, it is said in the passages in question, that an angel appeared, &c., is it not correct to suppose the meaning to be, that one of those ministering angels, which are represented as ascending and descending, appeared?

3. Particular expressions in the passages in question seem also to imply, that the angel was regarded as a person distinct from God. Thus Exodus xxiii. 20, compared with xxxiii. 2, 3. This is still more manifest in subsequent writers. See 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Job i. and iv. 18. Even the language of Exodus iii. 2, the passage which is most favorable to the theory under consideration, is not exactly what we should have expected if it were correct. It is there said, "An angel of Jehovah appeared to him in a flame of fire," &c.

Though not free from doubt, we think that the explanation

of the older interpreters is the true one ; namely, that by the "angel of Jehovah" is meant a personal angel, minister and representative of God, through whom God manifested himself, and by whom God executed his purposes, spoke, and acted. The angels, mentioned in the passages under consideration, not only spoke and acted in the name of God, as commissioned by him, but his name, his *numen*, divine spirit, was in them, in such a sense as it might be in many at the same time, so that they represented his person, and did not, like the prophets, commence their communications with, "Thus saith the Lord," but suffered their own personality to sink into the back-ground. We know that there was a tendency even in Moses and the prophets to forget their own personality, in communicating the will of God, and to confound themselves, as it were, with Him who commissioned them. Thus in Deuteronomy xi. 13, 15, Moses is represented as addressing the Israelites: "And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments, which I command you this day, to love Jehovah, your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul, that *I will give you* the rain of your land in its due season, and I will send grass in thy fields." So Deut. xxix. 2, 5, 6. "And Moses called together all Israel, and said to them, I have led you forty years in the wilderness; your clothes have not waxen old upon you, nor your shoes waxen old upon your feet; ye have not eaten bread, nor drunk wine, nor strong drink; that ye may know that *I am Jehovah*, your God." So xxxi. 22, 23; Gen. xlix. 7; Jer. xiv. 13. Is. vii. 3, 10. If then such language is naturally used respecting mortal men, living upon the earth, having numerous social relations, and engaged in other concerns besides that of communicating God's will, it is not unnatural, that still stronger language should be used in reference to angels, who are represented as existing merely to be ministering spirits around the throne of God, having no other employment than that of being sent from his immediate presence to bear his messages and execute his commands. We do not say, that the language used respecting Moses and the prophets is precisely similar to that used respecting the angels. But we do think it has such a resemblance to it, as to make our explanation of the language respecting the angels natural and probable.

This explanation has been in substance adopted by a host

of interpreters of all denominations, such as Grotius,* Le Clerc, † Calvin, ‡ and almost all the Roman Catholic interpreters. Amongst the Fathers it was adopted by Origen, who says in his note upon Exodus xx. 3; "God was there seen in the angel," which is to be understood by taking into view a passage in his work against Celsus, "Let us see how this professor of universal knowledge, Celsus, (Lib. I.) calumniates the Jews, saying that they are worshippers of angels, and addicted to the jugglery, which they learned from Moses. Where in the writings of Moses did he find, that that lawgiver commanded angels to be worshipped?" Also by Jerome, who says in his note on Gal. iii. 19; "When he says that the law was ordained by angels, it is meant, that in all the Old Testament, where an angel is first represented as seen, and is then introduced speaking as God, the angel seems really to be one of many ministers." Also by Gregory, who says, "Now they are called *the angels*, now, *the Lord*; because by the word 'angels' those are expressed, who ministered without; and under the appellation 'Lord,' he is intended, who presided over them within." § And especially by Augustine, who says, "It is

* Errant graviter, qui hic per angelum intelligunt secundam Dei hypostasim ob illud nomen יהוה. Variis enim multiplicibusque modis Deus locutus est patribus; at per Filium ultimis demum temporibus ad nos cœpit loqui. Heb. i. 1. Quomodo, igitur, is qui legem pronuntiavit angelus dicit, ego יהוה, ita et alii, qui ad res magnas a Deo legati sunt, angeli loquuntur, sicut verba judicis præco enunciat." — Grotius on Exod. xx. 1.

† Nomen Jehovah, si propriè loquamur, non tribuitur angelis, sed Deo in iis apparenti; quemadmodum, nullâ ratione instrumenti habitâ, ei qui instrumento utitur actio tribui solet. Sic dicitur rex scripsisse, quod scriba regius exaravit. Nec periculum fuit, ne Israelitæ pro Deo angelum propterea colerent; obversabatur enim eorum animis Deus deorum, cœli et terræ Creator: seu ipse loqueretur, seu per interpretem angelum, nihil intererat, rectè ad eum ferebatur eorum cultus." — Le Clerc on Gen. xvi. 13.

‡ His note upon Is. lxiii. 9, is as follows. "Vocatur hic angelus faciei, quia testis fuit Dei præsentiae, et quasi ejus apparitor ad jussa exsequenda; ne putemus angelos prodire a seipsis, aut proprio motu se ingerere, ut opem nobis ferant, sed a Deo mitti, ut sint ministri salutis nostræ. Ergò ne hæreamus in ipsis, quum ad Deum rectè nos ducunt. Potest de Christo exponi."

§ Greg. M. Mor. Lib. 28, c. 1.

therefore manifest, that all those things, which were seen by the fathers, when God was presented to them in accordance with a dispensation adapted to their times, were transacted by the agency of creatures. And if we are unable to say in what way he did these things by the agency of angels, still we assert, that these things were done by angels, not relying, however, upon our own reason. For we have the authority of the divine Scriptures, &c." Heb. ii. 2. "But, says some one, Why is it then written, The Lord spoke to Moses? Why not rather, The angel spoke to Moses? For the same reason as when a herald pronounces the words of the judge, it is not written in the records of the court, *The herald said*, but, *The judge said*. I suppose it now to be sufficiently demonstrated, that, when God is said to appear to our ancient fathers, before the incarnation of the Saviour, those words or corporeal forms were exhibited by angels." *

Here, in relation to the first proposition, which Hengstenberg aims to establish, namely, that the angel, in the passages in question, is a person distinct from Jehovah and yet essentially the same being with him, is an end of the argument, so far as the Old Testament is concerned. But our author has sought to strengthen his position by taking the subject into the wilderness of Jewish tradition, and thither we are obliged to follow him or leave our article incomplete. We shall just remark in the first place, however, that if all that he attempts to prove from the Midrashim and the Cabalists, and much more, were conceded to him, it would not have the least weight with us in the interpretation of the passages in question. But, reserving some remarks on this point for a subsequent part of our article, we are willing to investigate the opinions of the Jews on the subject. But we will not confine ourselves, as Hengstenberg has done, to the most modern and most obscure of the Jewish writers, the Allegorists and the Cabalists, but will examine the more ancient sources of Jewish opinions, as well as those to which he has referred.

The most ancient source of Jewish opinions, independent of the Bible, is the Alexandrine version or Septuagint, which, or the greater part of which, was made probably more than one hundred and thirty years before Christ. †

* Augustin. de Trinitate, iii. 11.

† See the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus.

The Alexandrine version clearly favors the view we have given of "the angel of Jehovah," as being no particular, pre-eminent, uncreated angel, the second person in the Trinity, but only a common angel, one of many. In every one of the passages in question, when the angel is introduced, the article is omitted before it. It is simply ἄγγελος κυρίου, *an* angel, not ὁ ἄγγελος, *the* angel. Nor is the omission of the article accidental. For, after the angel has been introduced, the article is always used, to denote the particular angel before mentioned. See Gen. xvi. 7, &c., xxii. 11; Exod. iii. 2; Judges vi. 11, xiii. 3. In Judges xiii. 21, we have a striking illustration of the preceding remarks. "But *the* angel of the Lord," ὁ ἄγγελος, i. e. *the* angel which had appeared to them before, "did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was *an* angel of the Lord," ἄγγελος.

The opinion of the Alexandrine translators is also manifested in Judges ii. 1. The Hebrew is like the Common Version. "An angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt," &c. In the Septuagint, before the words "I made you to go up," &c. we find the explanatory interpolation, *Τάδε λέγει ὁ κύριος.*

Indeed so far are the Alexandrine translators from favoring the Trinity, that St. Jerome, in his preface to the Pentateuch, says, that, "whenever they found any thing relating to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they explained it in a different way, or were wholly silent about it." *

The Apocrypha we have not examined sufficiently to be able to say what were the opinions of the authors in relation to our subject. Hengstenberg quotes nothing from them. Two passages used to be quoted, with the view of showing the belief of the writer in a second person in God, from "The Wisdom of Solomon," the production of a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, who lived probably not far from the times of our Saviour. One is in chapter xviii. 15, 16; "Thine almighty Logos leapt down from heaven from his royal throne into the midst of a land doomed to destruction, bearing a sharp sword, thy unfeigned † (ἀνυπόκριτον) commandment, and, standing, he filled all things with death; and he touched the heaven, and stood

* See the passage in the common editions of the Vulgate.

† i. e. probably, *not to be recalled, sure to be executed.*

upon the earth." From the general character of this description, as well as from other parts of the book, in which it is contained,* we infer that the Logos here mentioned is not a person, but only a personification of the energy of God. I believe this is now generally admitted.

One other passage used to be quoted from the Apocrypha, viz. Eccles. li. 10, "I called upon the Lord, the Father of my Lord," &c. It is difficult to see how this verse can be supposed to prove any thing in regard to the Deity of the Messiah, if it were supposed to be genuine. But it is now generally admitted that the text is corrupt, and that it should be, "I called upon the Lord, upon my Father and Lord," &c.

After the Apocrypha we come to Josephus and Philo, who were contemporaries, and both of them contemporaries with the Apostles of our Saviour.

Josephus evidently understood those passages to speak of any angel, and not one preëminent angel. "*An angel,*" ἄγγελος, not ὁ ἄγγελος, or ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου, met Hagar.† He regards the three men who appeared to Abraham, as three angels, and does not seem to suppose that one of them was superior to the other two. "They declared that they were angels of God; ἐμήνυσαν ἑαυτοὺς ὄντας ἄγγελους τοῦ θεοῦ.‡ and that one of them was sent to inform them about the child, and two for the overthrow of Sodom." ||

* See chapters viii., ix., &c.

† Ant. i. 11.

‡ Ant. i. 12.

|| Other writers have a similar tradition. "Joma, fol. 37, 1; De tribus angelis ministerialibus, qui ad Abrahamum venerunt, Michael fuit medius, Gabriel ad dextram, Raphael ad sinistram. Bava mezia, fol. 86, 2; Quenam fuit differentia inter tres viros, Michaellem, Gabrielem, et Raphaellem? Resp. Michael venit ad annunciandum Saræ [de filio nascituro]; Raphael venit ad sanandum Abrahamum [a doloribus circumcisionis]; Gabriel abiit ad evertendum Sodomam. Objectio: Scriptum est autem Gen. xix. 1, 'Et venerunt duo angeli Sodomam vespera.' Resp. Michael cum eo ivit, ut Lotum eriperet. Breschith rabba, sect. 48, fol. 47, 1, ad verba Gen. xviii. 2; 'Et vidit, Schechinam scil. et angelos. Postea col. 2, ad verba v. 3, 'Domine si inveni gratiam,' R. Chija dixit: Ad maximum eorum hæc verba dixit, et hic fuit Michael. Sohar Gen. fol. 65, col. 257; Unus ex angelis venit, ut annunciarer Saræ de filio, et hic fuit Michael. Sohar Gen. fol. 67, col. 264; Schechinah venerat, reliqui vero sub illo erant instar throni." The two last passages, taken together and compared with the narrative in Genesis, show that the meaning of the latter is, not that the Shekinah was one of the angels, as some suppose, but that it was, like a bright light, over all three of them. So upon chap. xix. 1, "and Lot saw," the Sohar says,

Where in Genesis it is said, they, i. e. the angels, smote the men with blindness, Josephus says, "God smote them with blindness." So in describing the appearance of an angel to the wife of Manoah,* he says, "An apparition was seen by him; it was *an* angel of God, ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ, and resembled a young man beautiful and tall, and brought her the news that she should have a son, born by God's providence, &c. He exhorted her also not to poll his hair, and that he should avoid all other kinds of drink, (for so had God commanded,) and be entirely contented with water. So the angel, when he had delivered that message, went his way, his coming having been by the will of God: She entreated God to send the angel again, that he might be seen by her husband. So the angel came again by the favor of God." Yet he says afterwards, "Now Manoah was afraid that some danger would come to them from this *sight of God*, ἐκ τῆς ὀψεως τοῦ θεοῦ, but his wife bade him be of good courage, for that God had appeared, τὸν θεὸν ὥρασθῆναι, for their benefit."

We see, then, that the same use of language prevails in Josephus, as is found in the passages in the Old Testament. The meaning of Josephus evidently is, that God was manifested by means of the angel, as his messenger or representative. There was a proverb among the Jews, that the sent was equal to the sender.† The meaning of Josephus is made obvious by a comparison of two passages. In Ant. Lib. III. c. 4, (III. 5, 4, in Whiston,) he says, "He brought the people with their wives and children so near the mountain, that they might *hear God speaking to them*, ἀκούσαιεν τοῦ θεοῦ διαλεγόμενον, about the precepts, which they were to practise." But in Lib. xv. 8, (xv. 5, 3, in Whiston,) "Our ambassadors, which they have beheaded, while the Greeks declare that such ambassadors are sacred and inviolable. And for ourselves, we have learned from God the most excellent of our doctrines, and the most holy part of our law, by angels, i. e. messengers, δι' ἄγγελων. For this name can bring God to the knowledge,

"Vidit Schechinam. An vero aliquis videre potest Schechinam? Resp. Vidit splendorem unum super capita eorum ascendentem, et propterea dixit, 'Ecce, quæso, domine.' " — Schoettgen, Vol. II. p. 442.

* Ant. V. 10. 2.

† Mechilta fol. 5, 1, et 49, 2. Tanchuma fol. 16, 3. Kidduschin fol. 42, 1. "Invenimus ubique, quod missus mittenti par æstimetur." — Schoettgen, Vol. I. p. 387.

or the view, εἰς ἐμφάνειαν,* of mankind, and reconcile enemies one to another." Observe that it is said, that God was heard, and that he was brought to the knowledge or view of mankind by angels, not an angel, or the angel. It cannot therefore be pretended, that Josephus supposed the second person in the Trinity, or any preëminent angel partaking of the nature of God, to be denoted by the "angel" in the passages under consideration. Moreover, he says nothing about such a person, when speaking of the fundamental doctrine of Judaism, "God is but one;" Ant. III. 5, 5; IV. 8, 5. And when we consider the known sentiments of the great body of the Jews in the times of Josephus, our views respecting his opinions on the present subject are still more confirmed.

There may be a question whether Josephus regarded angels as having an independent and permanent personal existence. We suppose that he did so regard them, judging from the above quoted passages, and from Ant. I. 3, 1. See Whiston's translation.

It cannot be expected that we should go into a very particular examination of the sentiments of Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria.† We suppose, that no one at the present day will pretend that his doctrines or notions are Jewish traditions, or that they were derived from the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament. Many of his representations clearly have no other source than his own imagination. The chief source of them was the philosophy of Plato. He has no reference to the Messiah in all his writings. Schoettgen observes of him and the authors of "The Wisdom of Solomon" and "Ecclesiasticus," that concerning the Messiah, "magis muti sunt quam pisces." Schoettgen also says of the Alexandrine writers, "You may call them Semi-Jews more properly than Jews, for a knowledge of the Hebrew or Chaldee lan-

* Josephus sometimes speaks of a manifestation of God where there was no visible appearance. Thus, Ant. xv. 11, 7. "It is reported, that during the time the Temple was building, it did not rain in the day time, but that the showers fell in the nights, so that the work was not hindered. . . . Nor is it incredible, if any one have regard to the other manifestations of God," εἰ καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἰσίδαι τις ἐμφάνειας τοῦ Θεοῦ.

† For a more general and the best account, with which we are acquainted, of his notions respecting the Logos, see Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c. pp. 227 - 288.

guage, or of oral Jewish traditions, has been sought in vain in Philo by Jewish and Christian writers."*

Still, as many have sought to identify what they call the second person in the Trinity with the Logos of Philo, and as Hengstenberg has adduced one passage from his writings, we must not pass him by without notice; especially as we have no doubt, that his doctrine of the Logos, being incorporated with Christianity by Justin Martyr and the Fathers, was gradually matured into the doctrine of the Trinity.

There can be no doubt that the Logos was often regarded by Philo as a person, and it is true that he calls the angel, mentioned in the passages under consideration, a Logos or the Logos. Thus in regard to the appearance of the angel to Hagar, he says, "An angel having met her, which is a, or the, divine Logos."† There is some doubt whether by the angel he always means what he calls "the most ancient Logos," "the archangel with many titles"; because in several passages he calls angels in general *Logoi*. Thus in speaking of Jacob's ladder, he says, "The ladder denotes the air, which is the habitation of spirits without bodies. Of these spirits the purest and best, being ministers of the Almighty, as it were the eyes and ears of a great king, seeing and hearing all things, are by philosophers called *dæmons*; but in the Scriptures they receive the more appropriate appellation of angels. For they bear the commands of the Father to his offspring, and the prayers of the children to the Father."‡ "These *Logoi* of God, οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγοι, ascend and descend the ladder without ceasing."§ He says also that Jacob chose one of these *Logoi*,|| the highest in excellence, and brought him near to his head, upon which to rest it as upon a stone, i. e. to whom he might apply his mind as a teacher. And this Logos, he says, taught Jacob to wrestle, &c. In one passage, to be quoted hereafter, he calls the angel that appeared to Jacob in Bethel, "the most ancient Logos."

But whether he always understood this "most ancient Logos" to be denoted by the angel or not, it is very plain that he understood by him a being inferior to God. Thus, in

* *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Vol. II. p. 39.

† *De Cherubim*, I. p. 139. Edit. Mangey.

‡ *De Somniis*, p. 642. See also *De Gigant.* I. p. 263.

§ *De Somniis*, p. 643.

|| *τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἵνα λαβὼν*, &c. *De Somniis*, p. 640.

reference to Hagar's expression, "Thou art a God, who mayst be seen." Philo says, "Angels, the servants of God, are regarded as Gods by those who are subject to servitude, and to wearisome labors." *

In commenting upon Gen. xlviii. 15, "May God, who fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads," he says, "The more ancient blessings, by which the soul is nourished, are ascribed to God; but the later, which relate to escape from sins, are ascribed to a servant of God, θεράποντι θεοῦ." †

He says, "The angel, the ministering Logos of God, gave another name to Jacob." He then undertakes to assign a reason why Jacob was sometimes called by his former name, after it was changed to that of Israel, whilst Abraham was never called Abram after his name was changed. "It was," he says, "because the unchangeable God gave Abraham his name, so that it might remain stable; but the name of Jacob was changed by an angel, a, or the, ministering Logos of God, ἄγγελος, ὑπηρέτης τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, so that it might be seen, that none of those things, or beings, which are beneath the Supreme Being, τῶν μετὰ τὸ ὄν, can be the cause of stability." ‡

That Philo did not regard the Logos as God in the proper sense of the term, is also evident from another passage. "Do not," says he, "overlook that which is said, 'I am God that appeared to thee in the place of God' [Bethel]; but diligently inquire whether there be two Gods; for it is said, 'I am God that appeared to thee,' not 'in my place,' but 'in the place of God,' as being another. What then shall we answer. He that is in truth, or reality, God, ὁ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ Θεός, is one; but they who in a loose, or figurative sense, (ἐν καταχρήσει,) are so called, are many. Therefore the holy Scripture in this passage denotes him that is in truth God by the use of the article prefixed to the name, saying 'I am ὁ Θεός'; but him who is God only in a figurative sense, or by a figurative use of language, he introduces without the article prefixed to the word, saying, 'He that appeared to thee in the place' not 'τοῦ θεοῦ,' but only 'θεοῦ.' And he here calls his most

* De Profugis, I. p. 577.

† Ibid. p. 556. See the same thing in, De Confus. Ling. I. p. 432, and Legg. Alleg. Lib. III. Opp. I. p. 122.

‡ De Nominum Mutatione, I. p. 591.

ancient Logos God, without an over-scrupulous concern respecting the application of names."*

Speaking of Moses he says, "He uses the, or a, divine Logos, as the guide of his way, according to the oracle, *Exod. xxiii. 20*; Behold, I send my angel before thee," &c. And immediately after he says, "But after he has arrived at the height of knowledge, moving at a swift pace he will come up with him, who before led the way, i. e. the Logos. And then both, i. e. Moses and the Logos, will be attendants of the all-governing God."†

Again, "Let him, then, who is not yet worthy to be called a son of God, strive to fashion himself to the resemblance of God's first-born Logos, the most ancient angel, being as it were an archangel with many titles."‡

Respecting the appearance of the angels to Abraham, as related in *Gen. xviii.*, there are two representations in Philo. We will merely quote them, leaving it to others to decide, whether they are consistent, or whether he regarded them as consistent, with each other. "If some have thought that house fortunate and happy, in which wise men have happened to be received as guests, how shall I describe the height of good fortune and happiness, which belong to that house, in which angels, those sacred and divine beings (*ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις*), ministers and prophets of the Supreme God, by whom as ambassadors and messengers he communicates whatever he pleases to mankind, have deigned to tarry and receive hospitalities from men."§

The other is as follows. "For Abraham also, coming with zeal and haste and great alacrity, orders Sarah, who represents virtue, to hasten and mix three measures of fine meal and make hearth-cakes, when God, accompanied by his two principal powers, his royalty and his goodness, He, in the midst of them, being one, produced three images in the visual soul (*τῇ ὁρατικῇ ψυχῇ*), each of which could by no means be measured, for God is incomprehensible, and his powers are incomprehensible; but he measures all things, for his goodness is the measure of good men, his power is

* *De Somniis*, Lib. 1. Opp. 1. p. 655.

† *De Migratione Abrahami*, I. p. 463.

‡ *De Confusione Linguarum*, I. 427.

§ *De Abramo*, quoted by Le Clerc on *Exod. xviii. 1.*

the measure of his subjects, but he himself, the Sovereign, is the measure of all corporeal and incorporeal things. Wherefore these powers, obtaining the nature of rules and precepts, are a means of estimating things inferior to them. These three measures, then, it is good to have mingled and worked together in the soul, that, being persuaded that God is supremely exalted, who rises above his own powers, and is either perceived without them, or manifested in them, it may receive the impressions of his power and beneficence, and, being initiated into the most perfect mysteries, may not readily utter those divine secrets, but, using them cautiously, and preserving silence upon them, may keep them sacred."*

One other passage deserves our attention, because it is the only one quoted from Philo by Hengstenberg. It is adduced by him for the purpose of showing that the Cabalistic doctrine of the Metatron is as old as the time of Philo. What the passage proves is, that the Logos was regarded by Philo as a mediator, as the Metatron was regarded by the Cabalists as a mediator. We will quote the passage in the original, as we wish to give a specimen of the American translator's knowledge of Greek. It is as follows: *Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δι' ἀρετὴν [δωρεάν] ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόριον[ς] σῆμας τὸ γινόμενον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποιηκότος. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἐκείτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον.*†

Hengstenberg does not translate the passage. The translator in the Repository renders it thus.

"To the archangel and eldest Logos, on account of his peculiar excellence, the Father who begat all things, has given to stand as the one, who divides that which is made, from Him who made it; *and he is the object of supplication to the mortal destined for immortality, the ambassador of him who leads to obedience.*"

The true meaning, which we give in a translation rather more literal than is perfectly consistent with the English idiom, is as follows.

"To the archangel, the eldest Logos, the Father of all

* De Sacrif. Abel. et Cain. Vol. I. p. 173.

† Quis rerum divin. Hæres. I. 501.

things freely gave the distinguished office of standing on the confines, and separating that which is made from him that made it. The same is, on the one hand, *the intercessor to the Incorruptible for the continually perishing mortal, and, on the other, the messenger from the Ruler to the subject.*"

What an exalted opinion of American scholarship must be entertained by the German linguists to whom the Andover Repository has been sent, if they judge from such specimens of it.

We think it plain from all our quotations from Philo, that when he speaks of the Logos as a person, he regards him as dependent, and as inferior to God.

Hengstenberg does not appeal to the Chaldee paraphrases. We have examined the oldest of them, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, and find in them no support for the opinion of the identity of the angel with Jehovah. The Targum of Onkelos is generally a literal translation of the Hebrew. Yet, in his version of Exodus xxiii. 21, he has indicated his opinion in relation to the subject. The expression, "for my name is in him," which Hengstenberg supposes to mean that the angel partook of the nature of Jehovah, Onkelos renders, "for his word," i. e. the word of the angel, "is in my name," i. e. with my authority.

The Targum of Jonathan upon Isaiah lxiii. 9, does not favor the idea of the identity of the angel with Jehovah. The phrase, "the angel of his presence," is by him rendered, "the angel *sent* from his presence."

We are glad to find that the expression, "the word of Jehovah" in the Chaldee paraphrasts is not brought forward by Hengstenberg, as denoting a person distinct from Jehovah. We presume he was satisfied that the word of a person in the targums is but a fuller expression to denote the person himself. Thus, Job vii. 8, "Thine eyes are upon me" is in the targum "Thine eyes are upon my word." Job xxvii. 3, "My spirit within me" is in the targum "My spirit in my word." 2 Chron. xvi. 3, "There is a league between me and thee," is in the targum "between my word and thy word." So the word of Jehovah denotes merely Jehovah himself. Formerly, when we were in the habit of taking quotations upon trust more than we now are, we were puzzled with an error, which we do

not remember to have seen corrected, in a reference of Dr. Allix to Psalm cx. 1, which he says was rendered in the Targum of Jonathan, "Jehovah said *to* his word." The same assertion is found in Taylor's Ben Mordecai's Letters,* supported by a quotation from Bishop Bull's Works. But, upon examining the passage, we find it to be "Jehovah spake *by* his word," אָמַר יְיָ בְּמִמְרֵיהֶּ, i. e. "Jehovah by himself," or "Jehovah himself." The preposition ל not ב would certainly have been used to denote *to*. The expression is one of not infrequent occurrence in the targums. Thus, "By myself I have sworn" is in the targum "By my word I have sworn." בְּמִמְרֵי. See Gen. xxii. 16, Ex. vi. 8, Ezek. xvi. 8, Is. xii. 3, in the targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. The meaning of the Chaldee Paraphrast in regard to Psalm cx. 1, is also obvious from the context: "Jehovah said by his word, that he would make me king of all Israel. But he said moreover, Wait thou till Saul dies."†

Hengstenberg's principal reliance in regard to Jewish tradition is upon the writings of the Cabalists, whose great aim is to find mysteries in the letters of the words of the Bible, and especially in the letters of the name "Jehovah." The book Sohar, of which we shall speak hereafter, is his principal authority. He thinks he finds the doctrine of an angel, who was "a distinct person from God and yet God himself," in the Metatron of the Cabalists. We think that the fair conclusion from the passages, which he adduces, is, that the angel Metatron was not regarded by any of them in any other light than as the first of angels, the high chancellor of Heaven, as Buxtorf says he is called in the Targum of Jonathan, whom nothing separated from God, i. e. between whom and God no being intervened. We think it probable that the name Metatron is an appellative derived from the Latin *metator*, i. e. one who goes before an army to prepare the camp, &c. The exalted character, which the Cabalists have ascribed to him, may have

* Page 348.

† As to the cause of the Paraphrast's rendering, I suppose he read or regarded לְאֹרְנִי as לְאֹרְנִי; and, as ל denotes *by* as well as *to*, of course he would understand it "Jehovah said by the Lord"; and this, according to the idiom explained on page 214, would be the same as, "Jehovah said by himself," or "Jehovah himself said"; and this meaning he expressed by saying, "Jehovah said by his word."

been derived from the Logos of Philo in part, and in part from the passages of the Old Testament respecting angels. He is everywhere called an angel, and represented as created, and as having received all his power from God. Thus in the passage quoted by Hengstenberg, as setting forth his highest attributes. It is a mystical comment in Sohar upon Genesis xxiv. 2, "And Abraham said unto the eldest servant of his house." "The Metatron is the servant of Jehovah, the eldest of his household, the beginning of his creatures,* exercising dominion over all things, which have been committed to him, and God has delivered to him the dominion over all his hosts."

In another from the same book, quoted in Schoett. II. p. 17, "The Metatron is the middle pillar, who makes peace with the higher, as that beauty, whose name is as the name of his Lord, created after his image and likeness, comprehending all steps or degrees above downward and down upward, terminating in the middle state," *concludens in medietate*, (i. e. in being between the Supreme Being and his creatures.)

When the Cabalist says that the name of the Metatron is "as the name of his Lord," we presume he refers to the circumstance, that the angel, which appeared to the patriarch, is sometimes called God. But it is wholly inconsistent with the rest of the passage, to suppose that he regarded the servant as the same being with his lord.

That by the phrase, "beginning of his creatures," he understood "the first creature that was made," is evident from other passages. Thus,† "In the beginning God created, i. e. the Metatron, whom God created the first and the beginning of his whole host of heaven and things below. This is the little Adam, (elsewhere called Adam Cadmon, or the first Adam,) whom God made in his higher image and likeness without any mixture."

It may be true, as Hengstenberg endeavours to show by a quotation from R. Ruben fil. Hoshke, that the Cabalists speak of two Metatrons, a higher, and a lower who was said to be

* i. e. the first being created, as it is understood by Schoettgen, who sometimes has "initium," sometimes "principium"; and, for aught we know, by all who have quoted it. See Schoett. Vol. II. p. 367.

† Tikkune Sohar, c. 67. Schoett. II. p. 410.

Enoch.* But the passages above quoted relate to the higher Metatron, and as such are brought forward by Hengstenberg.

Another reason against the supposition that the Cabalists regarded the Metatron as the same being with Jehovah, is, that they thought him to be the angel Michael. This is expressly asserted by Schoettgen, (II. p. 17,) and by Hengstenberg. But that the angel Michael was regarded by any of the Jews as identical with the Supreme Being is a supposition at war with all their traditions, and also with the Scriptures. Jude, 9. He was regarded as one of the angels of God, though the first of them. He was the opposer of Sammael or Satan before God in the court of heaven.† He is also represented as the high priest of heaven,‡ and as one who introduces the good into heaven.§ So the Metatron was said to be the opener and the shutter, i. e. one who opens or shuts the gates of prayer or of prophecy.||

We think we have quoted enough to show that by the Metatron, the Cabalists understood a derived being; (not to use in the strictest sense the term *created*, which may mean that he was formed by emanation from God;) that he was a de-

* See Schoett. II. p. 473.

† See Sohar Levit. fol. in Schoettgen, Vol. II. p. 657. "Datur servus bonus et servus malus. Mysterium Metatronis est servus bonus et domino fidelis; mysterium vero Sammaelis est servus malus." See also Sohar, Exod. fol. 102, col. 414, in Schoettgen, p. 659. "Is est Michael, lux dextra, *ἰσχυροσ* magnus Israelis. Quando enim latus alterum stat ad avertendum seu decipiendum Israelitas, tunc Michael portat populum suum, et factus est *συνήγορος* pro Israelitis, et liberat eos ab accusatione adversarii. Excepto illo tempore, quo Hierosolyma devastata est; tunc enim prævaluerunt peccata eorum, et Michael nihil potuit efficere contra partem alteram, ut Israelitas portaret. Nam Michael tunc debilis factus est Israelitarum causâ."

Schemoth Rabba, Schoettgen, II. p. 660. "Michael et Sammael stant coram Schechina. Satan accusat, Michael autem excusat."

‡ Sohar Genes. fol. 56, col. 223. Schoettgen, II. 644. "Michael sacerdos summus superior est omnibus illis, qui januas custodiunt, i. e. angelis."

§ So in Sohar, Schoettgen, II. 643. R. Joseph tradidit; "Quemadmodum sacerdos summus est inferius, sic Michael, princeps magnus, sacerdos est in cælo superius; et ille prævenit animam, benedicendo ei, postea etiam benedicit (celebrat) Deum sanctum benedictum."

|| So Sohar Genes. fol. 77. col. 303. Dixit R. Isaac. "Quando anima digna est, quæ introducatur per portas Hierosolymæ supernæ, Michael princeps magnus ipsam comitatur, ipsique pacem apud Angelos ministeriales conciliat," &c. Schoettgen, II. 657.

|| See Schoett. II. p. 325, 661.

pendent being, having a lord, and having received all his offices and powers from God.

Hengstenberg quotes a few passages, which seem to him to prove that he was regarded by the Cabalists as the same being with God; a few especially in which he is called the Shechinah.* It is true that he is so called. But this by no means proves that the Metatron was regarded as identical with the Shechinah, but rather the reverse. It proves only, that the Shechinah *dwelt* with him, or in him. The language is explained by a passage, which he himself quotes from Rabbi Moses Corduero, "The angel here is the *vestment* of the Shechinah, and the Shechinah conceals himself in the midst of him, and shows his operations by him. *Yet is he not the Shechinah itself*, but, if it were proper, I would call him the Shechinah's place of exile." So the temple is called the Shechinah, "the lowest Shechinah," † as the Metatron might be the highest.

So the voice which Adam heard in the garden was the Shechinah. ‡ It was in or with Isaac, when he blessed Jacob. § It dwelt in the hands and fingers of the priest. ||

* Shechinah, שְׁכִינָה, is a Chaldee word, which literally denotes *dwelling, habitatio*. Hence it was used to denote that visible brightness, or glory, which dwelt in a place or person, as a token of the divine influence, or the representative of his presence, and sometimes to denote the person or place, in which it dwelt. Exod. xxiv. 16. "And the glory of Jehovah dwelt," &c. וַיֵּשְׁבֶן קְבוֹר יְהוָה may be considered as the source of the expression.

† Tikkune Sohar, c. 28, fol. 28, 1. "Templum vero est omnium Schechinah infima." Schoettgen, II. 288.

‡ Tikkune Sohar, c. 61. "Vox in horto erat Schechinah." Schoettgen, II. 439.

§ Sohar Genes. fol. 83, col. 382. "Ecce Schechinah fuit cum eo. Nam nisi cum eo habitasset, quomodo Jacobo potuisset benedicere." Again, fol. 85, col. 335. upon Genes. xxvii. 30. "Exeundo exivit Jacobus." Bis hoc verbum ponitur, semel respectu Schechinæ, postea respectu Jacobi; cum enim Jacobus exiret, Schechinah cum ipso exivit. Nam præsentem Schechinâ benedictio facta est. Isaacus verba recitavit, Schechinah vero ipsi adstipulata est." Schoettgen, II. 444.

|| Sohar chadash, fol. 361. "Quando Israelitæ puri et benedictione digni fuerunt, manus sacerdotis facile, sine difficultate, attolli, et verba cum lætitiâ et voluptate cordis recitari potuerunt. Tunc, cum Schechinah in digitis habitavit, illi semetipsos extulerunt, et sacerdos cognovit, quod Israelitæ benedictione digni essent, iisque cum lætitiâ cordis benedixit." Schoettgen, II. 457.

In the book Sohar we find the following passage respecting Michael. "Wherever you find Michael, who is the first of them, i. e. the angels, there understand the Shechinah." So Schemoth rabba, sect. 2, fol. 104, 3. "Wherever Michael is said to have appeared, there understand it of the glory of the divine majesty." Schoettgen, II. 15. But it is evident from the quotations on page 226, where the Shechinah is said to have hovered over three angels, Michael being amongst them, that all that is meant is, that the Shechinah was *with* him. So Sohar Genes. fol. 84, col. 484. "In that hour Michael was appointed to go to Jacob, and the Shechinah *with him*, because Isaac knew (the Shechinah.)" Schoettgen, II. p. 444.

By these passages we presume is to be explained the passage quoted by Hengstenberg from Rabbi Bechai, a writer of the latter part of the thirteenth century, of course an antitrinitarian himself, and "held in high estimation," says Schoettgen, "by the Jews," those determined opposers of the Trinity. R. Bechai says, "The Rabbins explain the words אל תמר בו 'Thou shalt not change me for him,' (in such a way that you shall think me one and him another,) and God says this to Moses that he may understand that both are one, and most intimately united without separation. He is the Lord himself, and at the same time is the ambassador of the Lord." It does not appear from this quotation that it relates to the Metatron. If it does relate to him, it is explained by what is said above of the Shechinah's dwelling in the Metatron, &c. Language very similar is used in the Sohar respecting the Israelites. "Some are sealed by the habitation of the blessed God. These are they who observe the law and perform good works in the name of God and the Shechinah, *who are not separated from them*, but, as children partake of the honor of their father and mother, so every one of them is united and sealed with the middle pillar and the Shechinah. *In him they are as it were one.*" *

* Sohar Exod. fol. 49, col. 194. "Alii denique per habitationem Dei S. B., quem confitentur, obsignati sunt. Hi sunt, qui legi et bonis operibus operam dent, nomine Dei S. B. et Schechinæ, qui ab illis non separantur, sed sicut filii solent participare honorem patris et matris, sic unusquisque illorum conjunctus et obsignatus est cum columnâ mediâ et Schechinâ; *in illo quasi unum sunt.*" Schoett. II. p. 276.

Sohar Gen. fol. 85, col. 347. Schoett. p. 338, in a remark upon Jacob's ladder. "Nam Deus S. B. in eis (angelis) descendit, ut Schechinam recipiat, et Deus S. B. cum *tali homine unitur per preces.*"

We find also in Tikkune Sohar c. 18, fol. 28, 2, that "many angels ascend with the Shechinah, who are called faces of the Lord." *

If the quotation from R. Bechai relate merely to an angel mentioned in the Pentateuch, he may have adopted the opinion, which has prevailed in modern times, that the angel was nothing personal in itself, but only a visible form, of which the intelligent spirit was God. The known opinions of Bechai, and the Jews with whom he was a popular writer, are sufficient to show, that he did not understand the passage in the sense contended for by Hengstenberg.

Thus we find that there is nothing in the traditions of the Jews to warrant the supposition, that any of them believed in a being, who was a distinct person from God, and yet essentially and numerically the same being with him. In fact we are not sure that Hengstenberg himself believed the Metatron to be one with God in any other sense than as every man is one with Adam, namely, by partaking of the same nature with Adam. He says, "The ancient Jews found in all the passages, where the angel of God is spoken of, neither an inferior angel, nor a natural cause, *nor the invisible God himself*, but the proper mediator between God and the world, the author of all revelations, to whom they gave the name Metatron."

In another passage Hengstenberg appears to make the Jewish doctrine his own. "The New Testament teaches us to know God, the Father of Jesus Christ, as a spirit everywhere present, but who never appears under a form or covering which is subject to the senses. But, besides this invisible God, the New Testament makes us acquainted with a visible or manifested God, united with him by a oneness of nature, the Son or *λόγος*, who has constantly filled up the endless distance between the Creator and the creation, who has been the medium of communication, the mediator, in all the relations of God with the world and with mankind." Certainly this passage implies a belief that the Father and son are numerically two persons in the strictest sense of the word *person*, and is rather Philonism, than Orthodoxy as it is now understood in

* Tikkune Sohar c. 18, fol. 28, 2; in Schoett. II. 326. "Multi angeli ascendunt cum eâ (Schechinâ), qui dicuntur facies Domini."

New England. It varies but little from the Unitarianism of John Milton, Samuel Clarke, and Henry Taylor. But Hengstenberg's occasional remarks are not always consistent with the general statement above quoted. He uses the language, which we have employed in stating his opinions, in regard to the angel's *identifying himself* with God, and *being identical* with the Messiah.

At any rate, whatever may be his language or his opinions, he has failed altogether to establish on any good or sufficient grounds the first of the two propositions, which, as we have seen, are involved in his argument. In our next Number we shall show that he has been equally unsuccessful in regard to the second.

G. R. N.

ART. VI. — *A Sermon delivered in Worcester, January 31, 1836, by AARON BANCROFT, D. D., at the Termination of Fifty Years of his Ministry.* Published by Vote of the Society. Worcester: Clarendon Harris. 1836. 8vo. pp. 44.

DR. BANCROFT is one of the last survivors of a class of men, whom the friends of Liberal Christianity will hold in grateful remembrance. He has uniformly, during the lapse of fifty years, maintained a high rank among those, by whose efforts and sacrifices the public mind, to a certain extent, has been delivered from the thrall of creeds and other ecclesiastical impositions, and brought into the "glorious liberty of the sons of God." This change, indeed, in religious opinion and feeling must sooner or later have taken place in this country, and particularly in this part of it. It was, in the nature of things, impossible, that thinking men, after the subsidence of those high-wrought emotions which were caused by the Revolutionary struggle, and when they found leisure to read and reason, and were called to free and generous speculation on all other subjects pertaining to the great interests of life, should remain satisfied with the "beggarly elements" of the popular religion of the day. Still this change, like all other

moral changes, required the agency of clear heads and stout hearts, and of a martyr spirit, that was willing to dare and do all things for conscience' sake. Such men, through the good providence of God, there were; and of their number was the author of the Sermon before us. When we look back through the dim vista of somewhat more than half a century, we see him, together with Mayhew, Chauncy, Howard, Freeman, and some others like them, emerging from the surrounding darkness, illumined by the light of Christian truth above the measure of their age,—as the higher hill-tops catch and diffuse the earliest beams of the rising dawn,—carrying forward and reforming that Reformation, in this part of the world, which Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, with their coadjutors, achieved on the broader theatre of Europe. And it becomes us, who have entered into their labors, and are reaping continually the fruits of their firmness, discretion, and freedom of mind, to hold them in cherished respect and in honored remembrance. We should recollect, also, that they lived at a period, when denunciation was less harmless than it is now; when the cry of proscription was something more than an angry or empty noise; when the strong-holds of exclusive religionists, with their "captains of thousands, and captains of fifties," had not, as yet, been weakened by desertion, or betrayed by the unhappy attempts of friends in their defence. Dr. Bancroft says,

"Calvinism was the predominant faith through this section of the Commonwealth when my residence in Worcester commenced. Individual laymen and clergymen were known to dissent from the popular creed; and the clergy as a body at that period, I believe, were more liberal than the people to whom they ministered. Several ministers in this vicinity then thought favorably of liberal doctrines, but they expressed their opinions in qualified language, and, with a single exception, the system of Calvin was not openly attacked from the pulpit. Disputes and controversies were then frequent, but an exclusive spirit did not prevail." — p. 5.

The exception here referred to was that of the Rev. John Rogers, "a name," as Dr. Bancroft observes, "fitted to make a man independent in his opinions, and prepared to encounter every difficulty in defence of religious truth." He was the minister at Leominster, Worcester County, in this State. Being possessed of "intellectual power and an inquisitive spirit," and studying the New Testament more than the

confession and covenant of his church, he was betrayed, in the year 1757, into the startling heresy of publicly preaching against the doctrine of "Irrespective Election." He was not burnt, however, as his ancestor, the protomartyr, was. He was *only* cut off from all the sympathy and companionship of his church; — called to encounter, at every turn, the averted looks and pious horror of former friends; — avoided, as a sort of felon, by the great majority of those who had been his brethren in the ministry for fourteen years; — made to suffer a thousand petty persecutions in all the walks of domestic and social life; — arraigned before a formidable council composed of fifteen churches; — dismissed by this body from his parochial charge; — and then finally left, with this weight of ecclesiastical ignominy on his devoted head, to find a precarious subsistence, in such a world as this, where and as he might. Whether this slow torture of moral and social martyrdom was to be preferred, in point of suffering, to the fires of Smithfield, we do not take upon ourselves to decide. But of one thing we feel quite assured, — that he should henceforth be placed by the side of that great ancestor, whose spirit as well as name he bore, and like him be ever honored for his faithful and single-minded avowal of what he believed to be the truth.

But though the Exclusive spirit, in consequence of the better light that is now diffused among the people, is deprived of much of its power to harm, it has, in the opinion of our author, greatly increased among Congregational Christians during the last fifty years. He cites as a memorable proof of this, the doings of the Convention of Congregational Ministers, who hold their annual meetings in Boston. For many years, it is well known, while liberal clergymen constituted the majority of this body, the preacher of the Annual Lecture, which was established mainly for charitable purposes, was chosen alternately from the Liberal and Orthodox class. But when the latter gained a numerical ascendancy, this common courtesy, this common decency, was so far from being reciprocated, that, for several years past, no Unitarian minister has been permitted to preach on an occasion, the great object of which is to raise a fund for the support of widows and minor children of deceased members of the Convention, without respect to doctrinal differences. This has been long regarded with the disgust it deserves, both as grossly discourteous and absolutely unjust, in the minds of unprejudiced men. We doubt

not that many, who continue to participate annually in this wrong-doing, and follow submissively in the leash of their leaders, are ashamed of it in their secret hearts. What account the public has taken of it is evident enough from continual decrease of the annual contribution, at the lecture, since the change was made. The average amount of this for four years subsequent to 1816, before the system of Exclusion was carried into effect, was more than five hundred dollars. During four successive years commencing with 1832, in which this system was understood to be in force, the average of this annual contribution has sunk down to the almost nominal sum of less than ninety dollars. It were to be wished that these Exclusive Religionists could find some way of showing their own opinion of their own infallibility and self-righteousness, which would not defeat one of the leading objects of the Convention; and that, if they will turn a deaf ear to all the appeals of Christian Catholicism and Christian Equity, they would at least listen to the cry for the accustomed, and it may be greatly needed aid, which goes up to them from the Widows and Orphans of their deceased brethren.

The plan of Dr. Bancroft's Discourse is, first, to take a cursory review of the Ecclesiastical Transactions of the County (of Worcester,) and then to give a succinct History of the Society to which he has so long ministered.

Under the first head, he speaks of three distinct kinds of controversies which have prevailed, and which related to important principles. 1st. The prerogative of the pastor. 2d. The introduction of creeds compiled by human authority as terms of occasional communion, or of church membership. 3d. The power and right of congregational societies to dismiss a minister by their own act.

Disputes arose, as early as 1766, and were afterwards pertinaciously and angrily prosecuted, concerning the degree of power attached to the clerical office. Pastors, who had been regularly ordained, claimed not only the right of acting as moderators in all church meetings, and to be the executive officers in all the decisions of these bodies, which was conceded; but also to be a party, separate from the church, whose concurrence was necessary to the validity of its acts, and whose *veto* nullified all its proceedings. These prerogatives of the pastoral office were generally asserted by the clergy, as absolutely necessary to the due exercise of their

function, and were as generally resisted by the laity. It would have required no deep spirit of prophecy, to foresee the result of this contest. Men, who freely put their lives into their hands, and were always ready to go out and do battle with every body, and every thing, that infringed their civil rights, were not likely to go home and crouch down quietly under such an ecclesiastical yoke as this. Of course they prevailed. Attempted usurpation in this respect resulted, as it always will and always must ultimately result, in the successful assertion of inherent and indefeasible rights. Indeed at this day, when clergymen ask and receive scarcely any immunities of office, and when even their claims to personal influence are watched with sufficient jealousy, and are accurately enough scanned, this assertion of prerogative, on the part of our older clergy, strikes us as one of the marvels of their day.

An account of creeds as connected with occasional communion or church membership, in Worcester county, is next briefly given. But the history of these is the same all the world over. Arising in a vital mistake respecting the nature of human assent or belief, they can only be enforced by a series of inroads upon the inalienable rights of conscience. These produce a reaction, and thence ensue alienation, discord, hatred, and war, with all its associated and continually increasing train of dreadful evils and horrid sins. There are some home-put remarks, and rather searching queries of Dr. Bancroft on this part of his *Discourse*, — particularly those respecting the identity of the Calvinism of the Pilgrim fathers, and the Calvinism of those, who at the present day claim to be their exclusively legitimate sons, whether Professors of Colleges or not. These we recommend to the docile attention of all creed-makers, creed-imposers, and creed-receivers, here and elsewhere. The following dilemma, too, seems to admit of no resting-place between its sharp and wide-spreading horns: — “Articles of faith established by human authority cannot on any ground be defended. If these be discordant with revealed truth, they clearly ought to be rejected; if perfectly agreeable to Scripture, they are useless. True or false, the attempt authoritatively to support them is usurpation.”

The last class of controversies adverted to in the *Discourse* before us, were those occasioned by questions concerning the power of a church or parish to dismiss their minister. We

refer those, who are curious in these matters, to the very succinct and satisfactory account here given. It seems to us, that it is of no sort of consequence, in a practical view, whether a minister has any legal rights or not. If he have them, he cannot enforce them. And if he could, he ought not to wish to do so, since it can only be done at the sacrifice of those kindly feelings, and that mutual respect, without which his office must be as burthensome to himself, as it is useless to others.

"To apportion," as Dr. Bancroft observes, "the minister's compensation to his annual wants, on a declaration that this support will be continued through life, the parish taking the risk of sickness and infirmity, and refuse him a maintenance when providentially disenabled, all will acknowledge would be unjust. But no Congregational minister ever did, no one ever will, sustain himself in office by a legal process. Examine the history of ecclesiastical proceedings in this country, and it will be found, I believe, that in appeals to legal decisions, the people, without exception, have prevailed." And so, as we have said, they always will. A minister, who is wise, will find sooner or later, that the secret of his strength lies in an habitual consciousness of his weakness and dependence; will learn that no bond can be relied upon but the golden chain of mutual love; and will rest the adjudication of all his claims, in all respects, on that final tribunal where hearts come into judgment.

We come now to the second, and most interesting part of the Discourse before us, which relates to the Annals of the author's Parish. But as this interest is one of a local nature, we shall confine ourselves to some brief remarks on a few topics that may seem to have a peculiar claim to our notice. Of this description is the faithful but modest account the author gives of the efforts and sacrifices he was obliged to make in the earlier periods of his history. The religious society, with whose fortunes he has been, from the first and through the whole course of his ministry, associated, was composed of seceders from the first parish of the town of Worcester. "They consisted of sixty-seven men; most of whom were heads of families, and among them was a large proportion of the professional and distinguished men of the town, and a fair proportion of the farmers and mechanics."

Stated public worship was begun in March, 1785. A church was organized, and the pastor ordained in February, 1786.

The difficulties with which such little bands of Christians are obliged to meet, in asserting for themselves the rights of conscience, and in securing the preaching of what they deem a purer faith than the traditionary one of their fathers, are now no longer novelties in our religious annals. But the embarrassment and trials, to which this early association of Liberal Christians was exposed, are perhaps without a parallel in similar enterprises at a later day. We cannot, in the scanty limits to which we are restricted, so much as make a meagre summary of them. The seceders were not loved on account of their opinions. In the language of the late Lieutenant-Governor Lincoln, who advocated their claims for an act of incorporation before a committee of the Legislature, — "The majority of our inhabitants are rigid Calvinists, the petitioners are rank Arminians." Their experiment of a voluntary association for religious purposes was then new in the interior of the State, and was looked upon, and even by many wise and good men, as a dangerous innovation. The parent society, out of which these rebellious children came, was not a little irritated and overbearing. Its minister, the Rev. Mr. Austin, could not exchange with a brother of his own faith, because this said brother had offered a prayer in Mr. Bancroft's pulpit. The clergy of the county, with some few exceptions, were hostile. Great difficulties arose in procuring sufficient funds to sustain the new society. The period was extremely inauspicious to the effort. The Revolutionary war had just closed. Paper money became no money at all. The fruits and products of the earth were of little value as exchangeable commodities. Taxes were high, and creditors were importunate. Under this general pressure, it was deemed inexpedient to assess an annual sum upon the parish, and monthly contributions were resorted to. The minister was, afterwards, compelled to settle with the members of his society severally, when and how he could, — and why this alone did not break down his spirit, we cannot well understand. When a church was afterwards to be built, the experiment was thought to be too hazardous to be entered upon, unless the pastor would consent to relinquish one third of his legal salary, which, in the whole, was only five hundred dollars. This he complied with. And now, under the

pressure of all these adverse circumstances, what was the temper and bearing of our venerable friend, upon whom the pressure principally fell? Let him tell us:

"During these trying occurrences, I occasionally felt depression of spirits, and with difficulty could summon sufficient resolution to prosecute my professional labors. But I was firmly established in the belief, that the cause in which we were engaged was the cause of Christian truth, the cause of God, and I was unwilling to abandon it. I also knew that opponents were impatiently waiting for the prostration of a society which they deemed heretical; and shall I hesitate to confess, that I was unwilling to give them the triumph?"

"My income from the parish being quite inadequate to the support of a family, I was obliged to have recourse to extraneous means. We for years received as many boarders as our house would accommodate. I assisted several youth in their preparation for college or qualifying themselves for useful stations in busy life; through a long period I admitted in the forenoons of week days a number of the daughters and relatives of parishioners into my study, and gave them the best instruction in my power. The publication of Washington's Life yielded some profit; during several years I officiated as editor of one or another of our public journals.

"At no period was I destitute of cheering, animating supports, as numbers of the most substantial members of the society proved steadfast in their purpose, and continued my unwavering friends; they were persevering in their efforts to sustain our cause, and afforded me all the advice and assistance in their power. Encouraging appearances of success were not wanting." — pp. 21, 22.

Indeed the society, as a body, always seem to have duly appreciated the value of this excellent man and exemplary minister. Its almost unbroken harmony during the long period of fifty years, — long indeed for the endurance of any human connexion, — and this, too, amidst such discouraging and perplexing circumstances is equally honorable to minister and people. In the earlier periods of their connexion, moreover, he was continually receiving presents of various kinds, according to the ability and circumstances of the donors, which, considered as expressions of their respect and regard, of course possessed a value a hundred-fold beyond their own. And during the continental war in Europe, when all the means of livelihood rose greatly in price, he was aided by

special grants, and subsequently, as the society increased in numbers and resources, additions to his salary were made.

Still his efforts and sacrifices during the greater part of his ministry must have been great and trying indeed. His fidelity to his religious principles, and the firmness and consistency with which he maintained them, exposed him to the suspicion, or ill-concealed odium, or, what is scarcely better, the constrained courtesies of a large part of those, whose Christian sympathy he felt he had a right to enjoy. The condition of his society seemed to be repeatedly in a precarious state. Add to this, his professional income was wholly inadequate to his support. He was debarred, both by a sense of propriety and by a just deference to popular opinion, from all subsidiary means of increasing it, except those few and scanty ones, which were not considered disreputable to his clerical profession, but which, nevertheless, must have been pursued at the expense of time and labor which he would gladly have devoted to his appropriate duties and studies as a clergyman. A large family was dependent upon his sole exertions. Year after year, though passed in earnest labor, and in the practice of the strictest economy, and with every species of self-denial and retrenchment that his character as a gentleman and the claims of Christian hospitality would permit, he found his resources more and more straitened. He and his, like others, were subjected to the calamity of sickness with all its additional demands on a narrow income. But it is absolutely painful for us to go into this detail. Enough has been said for those who have the hearts to interpret it; and we have no words that will reach those who have them not. We allude to these circumstances here, mainly for the purpose of paying our humble tribute of respect to the Christian heroism of this venerable man, who, through successive years, in Godly simplicity and Godly sincerity, cheerfully, consistently, honorably, pursued the path of duty, thorny and rugged as it was; always faithful at his post, always the fearless assertor and champion of what he deemed to be the truth; always sustained by the approbation of his conscience; always looking to God, his present witness and final judge, in a clear, settled, and filial trust. This is self-sacrifice indeed, and not its wordy semblance. And it seems to us there is more of a genuine spirit and steady manhood, more of truly high endeavour, more of really elevated sentiment in

this calm, earnest, unfaltering devotion to the humble duties of his place and station, than is required in a host of that vulgar race of heroes, whom the world delights to honor.

It is an inquiry upon which we have no inclination or space to dilate, but still one we cannot but think worthy of the attention of thoughtful and philanthropic men, whether this is an insulated case, whether such conflicts as these, for life, with a scanty and insufficient professional income, are peculiar to our venerable friend ; and, — if it should be found on examination, that this is, by no means, the fact, but that there are many others suffering in silence and in hopelessness and from the same causes as he did, and that in consequence the moral and mental independence of clergymen is liable to be crippled, their efficiency impaired, their health shattered, and their lives, to a degree unexampled in any other class of men, prematurely closed,* — whether, if this be the real state of the case, to any considerable extent, it is not a subject worthy of the faithful and affectionate attention of serious and liberal-minded men. We are sufficiently apprized that

“ Greatness and goodness are not means but ends,”

and require not to be informed, that all who preach the gospel need to be armed and inspired with a martyr's spirit ; but still it seems to us a very grave inquiry, (leaving all individual cases out of the question, and disclaiming all personal references of every kind,) whether it is right, or wise, or expedient, or safe, to trust the supply of so great an interest of our religion as its preached word, to such an insecure tenure. Is there not great danger, moreover, in the state of things supposed, that we shall show to the myriads of observers on the other side of the Atlantic, who are looking to us with intense anxiety for a solution of the problem, — that the “ Voluntary System,” so called, as applied to the support of Religious Institutions, is a miserable failure ?

To return from this slight digression, we are happy in congratulating the worthy subject of this notice, his more youthful associate, and the religious society with which they are connected, on the success that has attended their exertions for the

* See some facts on this subject stated in the “ Christian Register,” of March 12th, 1836.

common welfare. At the commencement of the senior pastor's ministry there was scarcely a minister or church in the County of Worcester, that would willingly hold any professional communion with him, or suffer him to preach within their precincts. Now, we are told, that there are twenty-one societies, within the same limits, which are avowedly Unitarian in their principles and forms; and that not an "inconsiderable number of these are among the most numerous and respectable in the county." And if we rightly read the signs of the times in this section of our land, as well as throughout New England generally, there is a great and constantly increasing number of thinking persons, who, while they are still ranked nominally in Orthodox societies, so called, are finding it more and more difficult to pronounce, articulately, the shibboleth of the sect.

This interesting and very characteristic Discourse is brought to a conclusion, by a train of pensive and solemn thought. "If," says the author, "the question of improvement has respect to the members of the society, who are the individuals to whom I can appeal? They, who with me began their course of Christian improvement, are removed from life; but one man remains, of those who invited me to settle with them as their minister; and but two women now live, who, at that time, were heads of a family. With one exception, I am the oldest man in the parish, and his connexion with us was but of yesterday. . . . I have outlived my generation; and in the midst of society may be considered as a solitary man."

This is, indeed, an affecting example of the continually repeated lesson of the transitoriness of human relations, and the nothingness of human life. Fifty years ago he stood in the midst of a circle of nearly sixty families, most of whom were in early life. But he has lived to see one familiar face, after another, leave its accustomed spot in the house of God; and he has followed nearly six hundred persons of his religious fold to the "mightier congregation of the dead." But though he has "outlived his generation," let him not think that he is a "solitary man." Let him call to mind the sentiment ascribed to the elder Cato;—"Non cani, non rugæ, repente auctoritatem arripere possunt; sed honeste acta superior ætas fructus capit auctoritatis extremos. Hæc enim ipsa sunt honorabilia, quæ videntur levia atque communia, salutari,

appeti, decedi, assurgi, deduci, reduci, consuli." Let him feel, too, that he is held in respect and filial reverence by the children of his earlier associates and friends, and that, in the beautiful language of the Levitical law, they are all glad to "rise up before the hoary head, and to honor the face of the old man."

J. B.

ART. VII. — *Miscellanies*. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. In Two Volumes. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1836. 12mo. pp. 352 and 402.

THEY, who have read Miss Martineau's "Illustrations of Political Economy," will recognise the aspect of her genius, as displayed in the present work, to be another and the same, — reminding us of a strong family likeness pervading countenances of different features, while each is stamped with its own individual expression. In her "Illustrations," she treats of man in his social relations, and traces the good or evil effects which spring from obedience to, or violation of, those laws of production, distribution, and consumption, upon which the physical well-being of communities, and the happiness of the individuals composing them (so far as happiness is affected by outward circumstances), depend. Certain political and economical problems are wrought out, in which men and women stand for the figures. Though, in the prosecution of her task, most vigorous, just, and beautiful delineations of character are presented to us, and we are brought to see the very pulses of the naked human heart throbbing with hope and fear, joy and despair,—to watch that great conflict in which, with victory inclining from one side to the other, the mind and soul of man are ever struggling with the events which are his training and discipline, yet this is something incidental,—the illustration strictly; while the thing illustrated is a truth depending upon those physical necessities which are common to the race, and upon those laws of demand and supply, which are as invariable and unalterable as the laws of natural science. But, in most of the articles composing the present collection, the writer's aim has been to treat of those influences, which operate upon man considered as an individual, which are the common heri-

tage of humanity, the lessons taught by God to all his children, and which, though they may be modified by the position in which we are placed in social life, do not grow out of or depend upon it. Her themes have principally been drawn from that class of truths, which would concern Robinson Crusoe in his lonely island, no less than the inhabitant of the most populous metropolis on the globe. The religious principle, in its various stages of growth, and as operating upon minds of different classes and of the same class with different degrees of advancement, is discussed and illustrated with a fulness and clearness, admirable in themselves, and in such a manner as cannot fail to afford great help to those who are in any of the transition-states described. The sources of moral power, and the means by which the moral nature may be elevated and strengthened, are pointed out with a distinctness, which will win her the gratitude of many, over whose souls the dark shadows of doubt and self-distrust are yet hanging. She would fain lead the human soul to those fountains at which alone its immortal thirst can be slaked,—arm the human mind with those truths which are its proper panoply,—and fill the human heart with those affections in which alone it can find repose.

But the points of resemblance between the “*Miscellanies*” and the “*Illustrations*” are many and striking. There are the same beauty and transparency of style, the same freshness and originality of thought, the same sympathy with the race in contradistinction to certain favored individuals or favored classes, the same want of reverence for forms and creeds and usages and opinions which a man practises and holds for no better reason than that his father practised and held them before him, the same disposition to question, examine, and take nothing for granted, the same healthy devotional spirit, the same sensibility to every thing morally beautiful and true, the same comprehensive charity, the same clear-sighted faith.

The two volumes before us contain a variety of miscellaneous articles, originally written as contributions to periodical works, during the years 1829–1832. Among them there is, of course, much diversity of style and character, as well as inequality of merit. No definite plan has been followed in their arrangement, which was intended solely for

convenience of reference. Miss Martineau, however, in her Preface (in itself a striking and valuable production, and by no means to be skipped over by the impatient reader,) has given us a sort of *catalogue raisonné* of the various articles, by the aid of which, they assume the semblance of a symmetrical and proportionate whole. The book should be read in connexion with the Preface, not only to do full justice to the writer, but for the sake of the greater benefit which the reader may thereby derive from it. The following paragraph presents us with the "presiding idea" of the whole work.

"On looking over these pieces, after an interval of four years, during which they were wholly forgotten, it is evident to me that one presiding idea must have been in my mind during the composition of the whole; dawning over the first, and brightening up to the last. One piece bears the name of 'The Progress of Worship.' This name might, with equal propriety, be given to the tale called Solitude and Society; to the parable of the Hermit who went out to his matins; to the verses headed The Three Ages of the Soul; and to the 2d No. of the Sabbath Musings: and I am finally tempted to give this title to the whole book. Its application, however, might not appear so clear to others as to myself; and I shall therefore confine myself to indicating it by a second classification in this Preface." — Vol. I. p. iii.

Miss Martineau then proceeds to define and describe the various stages of the religious sentiment, and points out the several articles appropriate to each stage as having been written in reference to it. We should be glad to extract largely from this portion of the Preface; but our limits will not allow us to take the whole, and, justice to the writer forbidding us to dissever a part from its connexion with the remainder, we must content ourselves with the following paragraph at the close.

"I am far from imagining that there is any thing new or peculiar in this idea of the progress of worship: but, though it may be found traced out in every page of the Gospel, and wrought out in the lives of the noblest of heathens before, and the wisest of Christians since its date, it can hardly be said to be sufficiently familiar to us as long as we see religion treated as a concern apart from all other concerns; waited for, as for a morning and evening breeze, instead of being unconsciously breathed, as the element by which we live. It cannot be said to be sufficiently fa-

miliar to us, as long as any intend to be men of business in the prime of life, and Christians some time or other. It cannot be said to be sufficiently familiar to us, while any of us are supine under the abuses of society, or terrified at the march of events, or paralyzed by human opinion, or falling short in any way in those duties in which religious sentiment is designed to be a sufficient stimulus and support. Indifference in such duties is a sufficient proof that our religion has not engaged our human affections; that our worship, if we worship, has not advanced beyond the second stage of its progress." — Vol. I. p. ix.

The most obvious characteristic of this work, and that which strikes the most superficial reader at a glance, is the extensive range of its subjects, and the various forms in which the mind of the writer addresses that of the reader. Almost every sort of intellectual taste can here find its congenial food. There is the milk of narrative and parables for babes, and the strong meat of metaphysics and philosophy for men. Religion is here elevated to meet the wants of the doubting and questioning sage, and there brought down to the comprehension of the child, who, with clasped hands at his mother's knee, seeks to give utterance to the dawning sentiment of worship. In one place, we behold the stream of devotional feeling gushing warm from the heart of faith, and, in another, the spirit of examination and inquiry is pushed to a degree of boldness which will alarm some "weak brethren." Poetry and prose, tales and reviews, literary criticism, philosophical essays, metaphysical analysis, and theological speculation alternate with each other, and present their various attractions to various tastes; and yet there is a certain unity in the midst of all this diversity. Each production has the strong stamp of individuality. In whatever form she is presenting her thoughts, and whatever class of minds she is addressing, we can perceive that the same interests are uppermost with her, and she is not losing sight of that vocation to which, as a writer and thinker, she has been called. There is nothing of the tame formality of imitation, or of that coldness which springs from the same interest, or rather the same want of interest, in every thing; but there is the warm flush of sympathy on every page, and every sentence comes fresh and sparkling from the fountains of the heart. Her views and opinions are entirely her own, and have not been borrowed or taken upon trust. Whatever may be thought of their sound-

ness or correctness, their originality cannot be denied. However much a man may differ from her, he cannot say that these are not her own convictions, to which she has come by a process in which her mind has acted for itself and gone alone, whether its direction be right or wrong. The want of what is called learning is very obvious, and it is not easy to find a person, at the present day, when the temptation to over-read is so strong, who has thought and observed so much and read so little. Few of her intellectual resources have been supplied from books, and allusions and illustrations drawn from literature and literary history are very rare in comparison with those which come from actual observation of the two great worlds of sense and spirit. Where so vigorous and healthy a mind is left to develope itself after its own fashion, there results not only an originality in its thoughts themselves, but in the very garb in which they are clothed. The style of these articles has nothing of that formal cut so often observable in literary hacks who have served a regular apprenticeship to books, but it seems to be so appropriate to the matter that we can hardly conceive of its being presented to us in any other form.

It forms no part of our plan to pass a particular criticism upon each article in these volumes, or to express our assent to the many points in which we should agree with her, and our dissent from those few in which we might be inclined to differ from her. Of the work as a whole, we entertain a high estimation, and we are confident that it is not of that brood which "die and make no sign," but that it is destined to exercise an important and a deep, if not wide, influence. That it should become popular is not to be expected, since there is nothing, either in its matter or manner, to attract those who read merely for the sake of reading; it will find "fit audience though few." The timid will gain courage, and the distrustful, confidence, from its pages. It will be read in solitude with eyes blinded with joyful tears at having found sympathy for the first time within its mute leaves. It is a book which will help those, who are struggling to gain a victory over themselves and to convert their very infirmities into wings. The young, who are in that state of doubtful unrest which characterizes the early stages in the growth of the religious principle, when every thing seems mysterious, and, most of all, the waywardness and apathy of one's own

spirit, will here see the gleam of hope and hear the voice of consolation.

Among the readers of these volumes there will be, of course, a diversity of opinion as to the relative merit of the various articles composing them, each judging according to his own taste. Some of the reviews are full of thought and, as intellectual efforts, inferior to no portion of the work, though they will probably be the least generally read. Those of the "Essays on the Pursuit of Truth," of "Crombie's Natural Theology," and "Lessing's Hundred Thoughts," are conspicuous for their ability. In the first of these, Hume's argument against miracles is examined with great fairness and great acuteness. The general reader will find the essay on the "Characteristics of the Genius of Scott" among the most attractive, if not the most so, of all the articles, not only from its subject, but from the manner of treating it. It shows how much interest may be given to the most hackneyed theme by looking at it from a new point of view, and by transcribing the results of that observation, rather than by saying over again in new and finer language, what in substance had often been said before. It will be a question with many, whether she has not exaggerated Scott's ignorance of the humbler classes, no less than his want of sympathy with them, and whether she has not overlooked the dangers of so desultory an education as his was. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting some of her eloquent and striking remarks on the female characters of Sir Walter Scott, though over some of her views, as here expressed, not a few heads will be doubtfully shaken.

"Much has Walter Scott also done, and done it also unconsciously, for woman. Neither Mary Wollstonecraft, nor Thompson of Cork, nor any other advocate of the rights of woman, has pleaded so eloquently to the thoughtful, — and the thoughtful alone will entertain the subject, — as Walter Scott, by his exhibition of what women are, and by two or three indications of what they might be. He has been found fault with for the poverty of character of the women of his tales; a species of blame against which we have always protested. If he had made as long a list of oddities among his women as his men, he would have exposed himself to the reproach of quitting nature, and deserting classes for extravagant individualities; since there is much less scope for eccentricity among women, in the present state of society, than among men. But, it is alleged, he has made few of his female charac-

ters representatives of a class. True; for the plain reason that there are scarcely any classes to represent. We thank him for the forcible exhibition of this truth: we thank him for the very term *womankind*; and can well bear its insulting use in the mouth of the scoffer, for the sake of the process it may set to work in the mind of the meditative and the just. There is no saying what the common use of the term *canaille* may in time be proved to have effected for the lower orders of men; or in what degree the process of female emancipation may be hastened by the slang use of the term *womankind*, by despots and by fools. It may lead some watchful intellects, — some feeling hearts, — to ponder the reasons of the fact, that the word *mankind* calls up associations of grandeur and variety, — that of *womankind*, ideas of littleness and sameness; — that the one brings after it conceptions of lofty destiny, heroic action, grave counsel, a busy office in society, a dignified repose from its cares, a steadfast pursuit of wisdom, an intrepid achievement of good; — while the other originates the very opposite conceptions, — vegetation instead of life, folly instead of counsel, frivolity instead of action, restlessness in the place of industry, apathy in that of repose, listless accomplishment of small aims, a passive reception of what others may please to impart; or, at the very best, a halting, intermitting pursuit of dimly discerned objects. To some it may be suggested to inquire, why this contrast should exist; — why one half of the rational creation should be so very much less rational, — and, as a consequence, so much less good, and so much less happy, than the other. If they are for a moment led by custom to doubt whether, because they are less rational, they are less happy and less good, the slightest recurrence to Scott's novels is enough to satisfy them, that the common notion of the sufficiency of present female objects to female progression and happiness is unfounded. They will perhaps look abroad from Scott into all other works of fiction, — into all faithful pictures of life, — and see what women are; and they will finally perceive, that the fewer women there are found to plead the cause of their sex, the larger mixture of folly there is in their pleadings; the more extensive their own unconsciousness of their wrongs, the stronger is their case. The best argument for Negro Emancipation lies in the vices and subservience of slaves: the best argument for female emancipation lies in the folly and contentedness of women under the present system, — an argument to which Walter Scott has done the fullest justice; for a set of more passionless, frivolous, uninteresting beings was never assembled at morning auction, or evening tea-table, than he has presented us with in his novels. The few exceptions are made so by the strong workings of instinct, or of superstition (the offspring of strong instinct and weak

reason combined); save in the two or three instances where the female mind had been exposed to manly discipline. Scott's female characters are easily arranged under these divisions:— Three-fourths are *womankind* merely; pretty, insignificant ladies, with their pert waiting maids. A few are viragoes, in whom instinct is strong, whose souls are to migrate hereafter into the she-eagle or bear, — Helen M'Gregor, Ulrica, Magdalen Græme, and the Highland Mother. A few are superstitious, — Elspeth, Alice, Norna, Mother Nicneven. A few exhibit the same tendencies, modified by some one passion; as Lady Ashton, Lady Derby, and Lady Douglas. Mary and Elizabeth are *womankind* modified by royalty. There only remain Flora M'Ivor, Die Vernon, Rebecca, and Jeanie Deans. For these four, and their glorious significance, *womankind* are as much obliged to Walter Scott as for the insignificance of all the rest; not because they are what women might be, and therefore ought to be; but because they afford indications of this, and that these indications are owing to their having escaped from the management of man, and been trained by the discipline of circumstance. If common methods yield no such women as these, if such women occasionally come forth from the school of experience, what an argument is this against the common methods, — what a plea in favor of a change of system! Woman cannot be too grateful to him who has furnished it. Henceforth, when men fire at the name of Flora M'Ivor, let women say, "There will be more Floras when women feel that they have political power and duties." When men worship the image of Die Vernon, let them be reminded, that there will be other Die Vernons when women are impelled to self-reliance. When Jeanie is spoken of with tender esteem, let it be suggested, that strength of motive makes heroism of action; and that as long as motive is confined and weakened, the very activity which should accomplish high aims must degenerate into pure restlessness. When Rebecca is sighed for, as a lofty presence that has passed away, it should be asked, how she should possibly remain or reappear in a society, which alike denies the discipline by which her high powers and sensibilities might be matured, and the objects on which they might be worthily employed. As a woman no less than as a Jewess, she is the representative of the wrongs of a degraded and despised class; there is no abiding-place for her among foes to her caste; she wanders unemployed (as regards her peculiar capabilities) through the world; and when she dies, there has been, not only a deep injury inflicted, but a waste made of the resources of human greatness and happiness. Yes, women may choose Rebecca as the representative of their capabilities: first, despised, then wondered at, and involuntarily admired; tempted, made use of, then persecuted, and finally banished —

not by a formal decree, but by being refused honorable occupation, and a safe abiding-place. Let women not only take her for their model, but make her speak for them to society, till they have obtained the educational discipline which beseems them; the rights, political and social, which are their due; and that equal regard with the other sex in the eye of man, which it requires the faith of Rebecca to assure them they have in the eye of Heaven." — Vol. i. pp. 46–50.

The "Sabbath Musings" are full of beauty and originality. They are vivid transcripts of a state of devotional feeling, tintured neither with extravagance, bigotry, nor spiritual pride. They are as natural, as they are impressive. We have never met with any thing before, which resembled them very nearly. They breathe that healthy fervor, which is the unerring index of true religion, and, under the guise of emotions spontaneously bubbling up, contain important revelations of the manner, in which religion ought to mingle with every enjoyment of the taste, every aspiration of the soul, every effort of the understanding, and every impulse of the affections. To recommend them warmly to those who value religion and who have felt it, like sunshine, passing into their souls, would be superfluous; for such cannot fail to recognise in them, in a more beautiful aspect, the image of what they themselves have felt and thought.

The "Letter to the Deaf" is an admirable production, conveying important moral instruction, not only to those to whom it is addressed, but to all who are desirous of ruling their own murmuring spirits, and of gaining, through moral conflict and victory, that peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

The essay "On Moral Independence" is, however, that part of the book, for which we feel most grateful to her, and which we should be least willing to lose. To one who had never read this essay, it would seem as if the subject had long ago been exhausted, and that all, which could be said about it, was already familiar to the minds of reading and thinking men; but the first two or three paragraphs are sufficient to show us, that here the whole thing is put in a new light and made to rest upon a new foundation. Not only is the duty of moral independence made perfectly clear, — that it always was, — but we are made to wonder and be ashamed that any thing

could have interfered between the conviction of the duty and the carrying out that conviction in daily and hourly conduct. The mountain-wind does not more surely brace the languid frame, than does this essay the feeble will. It is entirely free from declamatory extravagance, and states and argues the question with that serene calmness which is essential to true strength. She writes as one who has long since gained that elevation to which she is inviting others to climb, without having forgotten the toils of the ascent. We are induced to value this essay so highly, not only on account of its great intrinsic merits, but because it teaches a lesson of which our community stands in need. Moral Independence is too rare with us. We are too much slaves to one another. Public opinion is a sterner despot than ever Tiberius was. By its pressure, the weak are crushed into despair and the bold are irritated into madness. The least common of spectacles is that of a human being, asserting his divine prerogative of taking counsel of his own spirit, and calmly smiling at the bristling front of opposition he may encounter. We want men who have courage to stand alone,—not men of stone, moral petrifications,—but men with heads to think and hearts to feel, and who, though yearning for sympathy, will consent to dwell apart, the very *Parias* of social life, rather than barter away their birthright of freedom. We cannot doubt that this essay will help to increase the number of such, and that many will have a new heart of courage put into them by it, which will enable them to brave the loudest storm of opinion that ever blew, if the voice of duty and their own conscience bid them.

We like this work for its honesty and its boldness. Many will lament that she did not suppress such portions of it as are strongly tinged with materialism (which tendency in her mind, we would remark, seems strangely inconsistent with the spirituality of her views of religion); and so should we, did we think that the interests of truth were best promoted by silencing the voice of opposition. Miss Martineau is a bold and consistent, but not a reckless, reformer. She can give a reason for every article of the faith that is in her. No fair-minded person can help admiring the manner in which she asserts and maintains her views, whether he may think those views right or wrong. There is no holding back, no reservation, no cautious qualification, no paring down and

clipping till all sharpness and prominence are lost; she speaks out her mind, and her whole mind, freely and fully, but with great candor and great fairness. There is no sophistry, no appeal to vulgar passions or vulgar prejudices, no contemptuous ridicule of what is too strong to be assailed by argument, on shuffling out of sight the true point at issue, no escaping from a doubtful conflict under a cloud of words. Though it may seem a singular epithet to apply to a work written by a woman, we have been constantly struck with its *manliness*. In using this word, we would not be understood as saying that it is not a truly feminine production, for it is eminently so; but it has that combination of strength, elevation, and dignity which seems to be implied in that expression. We shall look in vain in it for mawkish sentimentality, or sickly refinement, or feeble verbiage, or overstrained enthusiasm. Its tone is uniformly healthy, bespeaking a sound mind and a robust moral constitution.

There is a valuable truth taught, rather incidentally than directly, in these volumes; and that is, that the sense of the beautiful is the common heritage of humanity, and that there is something wrong in the constitution of that society in which any class is forbidden a participation in the pleasures of taste. The perfect compatibility of these pleasures with constant devotion to duty, even in its coarsest and most repulsive forms, is also insisted upon. These are important truths, though apt to be overlooked, even by philanthropists. We believe, that any system of education for the many will be imperfect, which does not include the cultivation of the taste; and that it is the duty of patriots and legislators, as well as Christians, to provide for the gratification of that faculty. That men will thereby become restless, envious, and dissatisfied with their condition, is a notion, as it seems to us, resting upon a superficial knowledge of the elements of humanity. In the following paragraph from the fourth number of the "*Sabbath Musings*," Miss Martineau expresses herself directly upon the subject, and her views do not appear to us to be visionary or impracticable.

"What an abode it is! If I did not know it to have been prepared for the luxury of those who seek the pleasures of nature in company, I should have imagined it built for the retreat of the philosopher. If I did not know it to be the charge of a peasant's

family, I should have looked for an inhabitant of a different class, — for a world-wearied or nature-loving recluse. How its bold front springs abruptly from the rock, while its projecting thatch is made to send the summer rain pattering among the pebbles far below! How snugly is it sheltered by the larch-plantation on either side, and its wall-flowers — is there any other place where they grow so abundantly? The rock is tufted with them in every crevice; they spring from every ledge, and fringe every projection. And what are the dwellers in this summer-house? The wood-ranger, and his wife and babe. They look happy, but they are heedless of what is before their eyes. They have possessed themselves of the best window, as if it were their Sunday privilege to monopolize the pleasures which their superiors eagerly seek on every other day. But what avails their privileged seat to them? That man's brow is such as should betoken high capabilities; yet, with this scene before him, he amuses himself with provoking the bayings of his mastiff. What mother, with her infant in her lap, can be insensible to maternal cares? Yet there is one who heeds not her babe, and who has no such intelligence in her wandering gaze as might account for the neglect. Why should not these, pupils, like the wise, of nature and of man, bred up, like the wise, in the knowledge of the gospel, feel the full beauty and solemnity of a scene like this? Nature has been ready to do her part; the gospel can never fail; it is man who has stinted what he ought to have cherished, and perverted the energies which it was his office to control. It is through evil social influences, that the eyes of such as these are turned from beholding the stars when, as now, they first glimmer through the twilight, and that their ears are closed to the soothing tones of the night winds, as they come hither from their roving over land and sea." — Vol. i. pp. 152, 153.

We feel under obligations, also, to Miss Martineau for her views of religion and of the nature and operations of the religious sentiment. They are such as are well calculated to meet the wants of the time. The age is carrying its practical, inquisitive, and investigating spirit into religious matters, and searching into the *why* and the *wherefore* of what has long been taken upon trust. Men are no longer to be influenced by such a form of religion, as would satisfy a Simon Stylites or any other devout lunatic, nor will they mistake an excitement of the nervous system for the inspiration of Heaven. The divine right of priests is as little respected, as the divine right of kings. It will no longer do, to tell a man that religion

is necessary to him, and, at the same time, present him with a set of doctrines which his reason compels him to reject. It is idle to inveigh against this spirit and call it hard names; for, whether right or wrong, it has passed into men's minds, and neither "bell, book, nor candle" will drive it thence. The religion, which the age demands, is one which will satisfy the understanding while it melts the heart, which is consistent with itself, which is overlaid with no "strange inventions" of man's devising, which recognises the elementary principles of humanity, and whose pure essence has not been smirched and soiled by the base hands of superstition, bigotry, and intolerance. Such is the aspect of religion, as it is presented to us in these volumes. Miss Martineau sifts, examines, and weighs, but she firmly believes and reverently worships. The inquisitive understanding is united with the glow of devotion, in such a manner as might be supposed to result from the combination of Priestley with Doddridge. In the formation of her creed she unhesitatingly rejects whatever she deems inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, by however great names it may have been sanctioned; but no nun ever clasped her crucifix to her heart with more devout sensibility, than she does the faith which her reason has told her is the true one. Recognising fully the existence of the instinct of religion, and that the soul of man hungers and thirsts for it and has but an imperfect life without it, she still perceives, that he craves a religion which he can understand as well as feel, — that the philosopher demands a faith which he may try in the crucible of his reason, like the science which he investigates, and that the laborer seeks an interpretation of the mysterious feeling which drops into his heart from the silent stars, as he walks home beneath their eyes. Her religion is not a cold system of negations which chills the heart of devotion, but it is full of warm life, and instinct with a life-giving principle. No one, who has watched the signs of the times, can doubt that religion, presented in such a shape, will be welcomed by many who have hitherto rejected, or been indifferent to it.

We take leave of Miss Martineau with grateful acknowledgments for the pleasure and instruction we have derived from this work. She says, in the conclusion of her Preface, "It gives me much pleasure to prepare for my American friends, at the suggestion of some beloved ones among them, a book in which they may read, with the eyes of their consciousness,

invisible records of the gratitude and love of a stranger, whom they have gladdened by their hospitality and honored with their friendship." Her "American friends" will cordially respond to these expressions of attachment and good will. She has helped us by her presence, as well as by her writings; and many will remember her visit, as an era in the growth of their minds and characters. Her image will be fondly cherished in many a heart, where admiration for the writer is swallowed up in gratitude to the woman. Her vocation is no common one, and, much as she has yet done for her race, we have a confident expectation that she will do more. Her

"godlike aim is to make less
The sum of human wretchedness,
And strengthen man with his own mind."

Her field is the world, and there are but few reapers to the harvest into which she has thrust her sickle. There are abuses in the best social system, yet to be removed; dark places to be enlightened, and crooked ones to be made straight. Errors, which have long struck their roots into the soil of the general mind, and resisted for centuries the strong winds of truth, are yet to be torn up. Moral and intellectual wastes are to be made to blossom, like the rose. The heart of man is yet hardened against his brother man, and misfortune is made to suffer the penalty of crime. It must be required of rulers and statesmen and legislators to act from a far higher set of principles, and to walk by a light from heaven, and not by the dim sparks of expediency and self-interest. The day is short, and the night cometh, in which no man can work. Obloquy and abuse and misrepresentation she must expect; they are the bitter ingredients in the cup, which every reformer must drink. This is the same world which stoned the prophets and burned the martyrs; and, though it is now esteemed bad taste to put men and women into the fire for their opinions' sake, the intolerance which kindled the flames of Smithfield still exists, though in a different form. But let her not faint or despair. Good wishes will go with her, and effectual, fervent prayers encompass her; and, though these should fail, there are the "three fast friends" which will not forsake the upright,

"Himself, his Maker, and the Angel Death."

G. S. H.

ART. VIII. — *A Narrative of a Visit to England*. By JOHN CODMAN, D. D., One of the Deputation from the General Association of Massachusetts to the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Boston: Perkins and Marvin. 1836. 16mo. pp. 248.

THE Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the English Deputation, composed of Drs. Reed and Matheson, went very fully into a discussion of local topics, with which the travellers, of course, were but imperfectly acquainted, and consequently fell into not a few ludicrous blunders. But their testimony, and even their speculations, were interesting and valuable on many accounts. Dr. Codman, warned as it would seem by their example of the danger of pronouncing judgment on the customs, and institutions, and parties of a foreign country, is not likely to give much offence anywhere in this way; but his inoffensiveness is purchased at too great a sacrifice. By confining himself almost wholly to the dry details of his journey, and barren generalities, and compliments more kind than discriminating, he has made his book as unsatisfactory as it well could be, coming as it does from a gentleman and writer of so much respectability. And yet in one respect it gives us a good deal more than the title-page promises; for we have here a narrative of a Visit not to England alone, but to Italy, Switzerland, and France, and of a flying excursion to Scotland and Wales, not originally included, we suppose, in the purview of the Delegation.

From Dr. Codman's statements we should infer that Unitarianism, under its different forms, is more prevalent among the French Protestants than we had supposed. Thus he says:

"We spent a few days in Marseilles, where we experienced much kindness and hospitality from several friends, to whom we brought letters of introduction. In this important French port, there is but one Protestant church, and that is supplied by three pastors, and has but one service on the Sabbath, and a catechetical lecture during the week. The doctrinal sentiments of the pastors, like those of many of the Protestant clergy in France and Switzerland, are Arian."—pp. 18, 19.

Again he says :

" A ride of two or three days, during which nothing occurred of peculiar interest, brought us to Lyons, the second city in importance in France, and distinguished for its manufacturing relations to our own country. We had letters of introduction to the Rev. Adolphus Monód, an Evangelical Protestant clergyman, who, on account of his attachment to the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, had been excluded from one of the churches in that city, and was now preaching to a small congregation of pious and devoted friends of truth." — pp. 17, 18.

Of the state of opinion in the French capital the accounts are equally encouraging, due allowances being made for his way of telling the story.

"The Protestants in Paris are not without their attractive preacher. They have two congregations, connected with the Protestant National church, one very large in the Rue St. Honoré, and a smaller one in the Rue St. Antoine. These churches are supplied by four pastors, who preach in rotation. One of them, Mr. Monód, Jr., is decidedly Evangelical, while his father, and the other two pastors, are supposed to be inclining to Arianism, if not to Socinianism. One of these, the Rev. Mr. Coqueril, who is the most decided Unitarian, is a man of very superior talents, and a most eloquent declaimer. When he preaches, the church is always crowded with a gay and fashionable congregation." — pp. 66, 67.

Dr. Codman reached London in season to attend the anniversaries of the religious and benevolent institutions in that metropolis in the month of May, in fulfilment of the various commissions which he had received from similar institutions in this country. The reception which he and his co-delegate, Dr. Spring, met with from one of these associations, the Church Missionary Society, was such as to give just offence.

"We were told by some of our Dissenting brethren, that we should not be invited to speak at this meeting, as we were not *churchmen*; but we could not believe it, as, whatever might be the prejudices existing in this Society against Dissenters from the Established Church in England, we imagined that they could not extend to the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of our own country, much less to regularly commissioned delegates from the American Board. *But it was even so.* Our commissions were read in the committee room, but no other notice of us, or of the Society we had the honor to represent. We were suffered to

sit in silence on the platform, and to listen to several addresses from Noblemen, and Bishops, and other dignitaries of the Church of England." — p. 84.

We are surprised and grieved to find how little interest is taken in the Temperance reformation by that portion of the English Dissenters especially, with whom Dr. Codman had most to do.

"There is a strange apathy on this subject among our Dissenting brethren. Very few of them appear to be connected with Temperance societies themselves, or to encourage them in their congregations. The British and Foreign Temperance Society, which I shall have occasion to mention more particularly in another place, appears to be supported principally by members of the Established Church, and by the Society of *Friends*. At the anniversary of the Society, where Christians of all denominations ought to be found, I saw but one or two of those excellent Dissenting ministers whom it was my privilege to meet at the Congregational Union and on other occasions." — pp. 101, 102.

It cannot be, one would suppose, from a belief that there is no call for extraordinary efforts in this cause; for, in speaking of the far-famed "gin palaces" of London, our author says:

"We were told by a friend, who stood on a Sabbath morning opposite one of these receptacles of sin and misery, watching the ingress and egress of its visitors, that he counted fifty persons, in one minute, coming out of the place, having taken their morning dram; and by another, that not less than fifty pounds sterling are sometimes taken on a Sabbath morning in one of these haunts of vice and misery, in sums not exceeding a penny. Among all the dreadful instances of intemperance that were too common in our own country, previous to the temperance reformation, nothing I think could compare with statements like these.

"I could not but be struck with the amazing difference in the habits of temperance, between those parts of the Continent which I visited during the last winter, and the British Isles. It was so rare an occurrence to meet with an instance of intoxication in the streets and roads, through which we passed in France and Italy, that I have not, at the present moment, a distinct recollection of a single individual case; whereas I cannot number the instances of beastly intemperance I met with in the streets of London, and in different parts of the United Kingdom." — pp. 140, 141.

A custom is also mentioned by him as prevalent at their public anniversary meetings, which for its bearings on this sub-

ject is not very creditable to those by whom it is countenanced and defended. On a table on the platform are placed decanters of wine, large glasses of which are handed to the speakers and others, sometimes, though not always, diluted with water. After this, many of our readers will not be surprised to learn that occurrences of a still more questionable character take place occasionally on these same platforms. Our traveller was present at the meeting of the London Missionary Society, where a subscription was opened on the spot for a special effort, and about five hundred pounds sterling collected, "some in gold, some in bank notes, and more in promissory payments on scraps of paper, handed up on the platform, with the amount subscribed, prefixed with the three vowels, i. o. u. (*I owe you*,) and endorsed with the name of the subscriber." The sequel is thus given.

"While the audience were uniting in singing the doxology, at the close of the exercises, some one, who had contrived to gain admission to the platform in the disguise of a gentleman, availed himself of the opportunity, while the backs of the secretaries were turned upon the table, upon which stood the bag, containing the amount collected, to appropriate it to his own private use. The robbery was not discovered until after the assembly had separated. It proved to be less considerable than was at first apprehended, as a greater part of the amount was in notes of i. o. u., which were faithfully redeemed, and in some instances paid with more than compound interest in an increased subscription. The ultimate loss, sustained by the Society, did not exceed thirty or forty pounds." — pp. 110, 111.

Dr. Codman's official relations, and his position in society, afforded him peculiar opportunities for becoming acquainted with the Orthodox divines of England and Scotland; but his notions of propriety, or other reasons, have prevented him from allowing his countrymen to profit much by the advantage. Of Dr. Chalmers, however, he says, in speaking of an interview he had with him at the house of a mutual friend:

"Much conversation ensued on the subject of the expediency of church establishments, and the inefficacy of the voluntary principle. Although I could not agree with the Doctor and his friends in their views on this subject, I was gratified in hearing what could be said in favor of the dependence of the church upon civil aid, by the most powerful and eloquent champion of this side of the question now on the stage.

"The health of Dr. Chalmers is by no means good, and he has not attempted to preach for several months. It would not be surprising if the excitement, superinduced by the agitating controversy in which he has taken such a leading and active part, should have tended to impair his physical constitution. The course which he has adopted, although, I doubt not, from the very best and most conscientious motives, (for he is utterly incapable of any other,) while it has strengthened the hands of a party, who are far from appreciating his piety and evangelical zeal, has disappointed and grieved many of the friends of religious liberty, who love him for his attachment to the doctrines of grace, and admire the talent and eloquence with which he has so nobly defended them."—pp. 211, 212.

It is but justice to add, that, notwithstanding our disappointment in other respects, we honor the scrupulous care with which Dr. Codman has forborne to thrust the private matters of other people before the public. We still entertain the opinion that there is much in the public character of eminent individuals, and in the ever-varying phases of sects and parties, to supply legitimate topics, on which the traveller, if he writes at all, may be fairly expected to give the public some new and valuable information. But, if we cannot have this without the flippancy, the retailing of idle gossip and of conversations never intended for the public ear, or those more serious betrayals of confidence which so frequently occur in the writings of modern tourists, give us in preference the cautious and well-bred reserve of our author, though it leaves him but little to tell which every body did not know before. ED.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

The Works of WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D. D. Glasgow: James Hedderwick & Son. 1835. 2 Vols. 16mo. pp. 466 and 500. — We hardly know in what terms to speak of this edition of Dr. Channing's writings, the second which has appeared in Great Britain. Of the publishers and their objects all our information is gathered from the short Advertisement prefixed to the first volume; from which it would appear that they yield to none in their admiration of the genius and character of the "great American classic," and that their principal motive in sending this edition to press was "to extend the range of his usefulness by

assisting to send his works through society in a form, cheap, and adapted to the present habits of the reading world." With these feelings and views we are a little surprised, that, so far as Dr. Channing's earlier writings are concerned, they have not confined themselves to the collection made and sanctioned by himself, in 1830; especially as in the Preface to that volume he expresses the wish in so many words, that none of his former publications, omitted therein for reasons which he assigns, might ever be found in their present form in any subsequent collection of his works. Our surprise, moreover, is changed into something very like indignation, on finding that, not content with undertaking to make a compilation of their own on principles in direct contradiction of the author's known wishes, they have not thought it worth while to consult him, or communicate with him in any way on the subject, but have chosen rather to be guided by report in the delicate matter of determining the authorship of anonymous compositions. The consequence is, as might have been expected, that one of the longest pieces in these volumes, entitled "*Remarks on Associations formed by the Working Classes of America*," we have the best authority for saying, was never seen or heard of by Dr. Channing, until to his astonishment he found it inserted here as a production of his own. This is too bad. Besides, the publishers have not only inserted what Dr. Channing never wrote, but have left out several of his later pieces, which he would doubtless introduce into a new and complete edition of his works; so that the Glasgow edition, instead of being, as it is called in the Advertisement, "the only complete one which has yet been published," is in every view singularly defective. We are grateful for every effort that is made to give a wider circulation to writings, which the publishers cannot appreciate more highly than we do; but no such plea can avail in justification of so flagrant a violation of what is due, not merely as matter of courtesy, but of justice, to the author himself, as we have here had occasion to expose.

A Harmony or Synoptical Arrangement of the Gospels: founded upon the most ancient Opinion respecting the Duration of our Saviour's Ministry, and exhibiting the Succession of Events in close Accordance with the Order of the two Apostolical Evangelists. With Dissertations, Notes, and Tables. By LANT CARPENTER, LL. D., Minister of the Gospel. Bristol, (England.) 1835. 8vo. pp. cxlvii. and 322. — Dr. Carpenter's long-expected "Harmony" has appeared at last, and promises to be a valuable accession to the theological literature in our language. It has evidently been drawn up with much labor and care, and the arrangement of the text, and the mechanical execution generally, are satisfactory in a high

degree. Four Dissertations are prefixed: the first, "On the Duration of our Lord's Ministry"; the second, "On the Structure of the First Three Gospels in relation to the Succession of Events in our Lord's Ministry"; the third, "On the Political and Geographical State of Palestine at the Period of our Lord's Ministry"; and the fourth, "On the Succession of Events recorded in the Gospels, giving an Outline View of our Lord's Ministry." Dr. Carpenter's "Plan," as most of our readers are aware, is the same substantially with that adopted by Dr. Palfrey in the *Harmony* published by him at Boston, in 1831; but it is more fully carried out and defended, and the text, which is the Common Version, has been subjected to a more thorough revision and correction. He proceeds on what he terms the *bipascal* system, making the public ministry of Christ to include but two passovers, and to last but little more than one year. Of his success in this attempt at a proper arrangement and collocation of the sacred narratives, he thus speaks in his Fourth Dissertation:

"Since the time when, by the consideration of the phenomena in the case, I came to the general conclusion which I still maintain, and this is now thirty years ago, — I have earnestly and I think faithfully reviewed them more than twice that number of times; I have sought for information on connected subjects wherever it appeared likely to be found; I have constructed Tables, and *Monotessarons*, and Outline Views, upon the whole, or on particular parts, and thus brought the Arrangement to a strict test; and, several years ago, I prepared a regular *Harmony* agreeably to it, which I have repeatedly considered. I can now trace every part of the eventful year of our Saviour's ministry, as far as we have records of it, with the sentiment which arises from the perception of distinctness and consistency. And to those who may not feel the same satisfaction, and who regard the whole as more the matter of conjecture than I can regard it, I would say, — If, nevertheless, this Arrangement appear to be attended with fewer difficulties than others are, and with more accordance with probability, adopt it, with what improvements you discover, — as loosely as you deem the nature and the degree of the evidence to require, yet steadily; and by degrees you will be able to follow the great events recorded, in a regular succession, like the events of ordinary life, and will find the reality of all become increasingly the object of vivid conception and faith."

The completion of this work, Dr. Carpenter tells us, will enable him to proceed with others which have been postponed to it. "Of these," he says, "the first will probably be a *Monotessaron* for the use of the young and uninformed. At some future period I hope to publish a similar work, for more general use, with explanatory observations and practical reflections." Of the book now under notice he informs us in the same Advertisement, that "the whole of the present impression, consisting of five hundred copies, is re-

quired for subscribers to the work, — though I must reserve a few, to be submitted to the examination of some able critics in this country, out of my own religious connexion, and of some of my brethren in Boston." Our only object here has been to announce the publication of the volume and its contents, intending on some future occasion to go more fully into an examination of its critical merits.

Religious Consolation. — Boston: Joseph Dowe. 1836. 16mo. pp. xxiv, and 227. — We have here a sort of book of which it is hardly possible to have too many; — a well selected and well printed collection of pieces in prose and verse, intended particularly for persons in affliction. The Introduction, on "Christian Faith," the only part of the volume which is original, is a valuable contribution by the compiler, Mr. Gannett of Boston, in which he speaks as follows of the object and authorship of the rest of the articles.

"They contain selections from English and American writers whose names are familiar in this community, — Price, Cappe, Channing, Dewey, Palfrey, Parker, Colman, and others. Many of the pieces here printed will be recognised as of recent publication. The idea of preparing the present volume arose out of the belief that these materials if brought together would constitute a valuable book of consolation. Other extracts of a similar character have been added; and upon whatever page the reader may open, it is believed that he will find 'words of comfort.'"

New Publications. — Mr. Kaufman's Translation of Tholuck's "Commentary on the Gospel of St. John" has just appeared. It makes a duodecimo volume of four hundred and seventy-four pages. A Translation of Olshausen's Commentaries on the New Testament has been undertaken at Princeton, N. J. Hug's Introduction to the writings of the New Testament, translated by D. Fosdick, Jr., with notes by Professor Stuart, will soon be published. A new volume on Hermeneutics is also announced as in the course of preparation by Professor Stuart.

